DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 073 SO 016 923

AUTHOR	Deem, Rosemary; And Others
TITLE	Excellence, Reform and Equity in Education: An International Perspective. Occasional Papers Series, Number 13.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.; State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Comparative Education Center.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	185p.; For other occasional papers, see SO 016 920-922.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, Comparative Education Center, 428 Baldy Hall, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14260 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Education; Developing Nations; Economic Factors; *Educational Change; *Educational Diagnosis; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Policy; Policy Formation; Political Attitudes; Political Influences; Public Policy; Social Change; Social Environment; Textbook Publication; Womens Education

ABSTRACT

The five papers presented in this monograph deal with the implications of the criticisms of education and the calls for excellence now evident in a number of industrialized nations. While the issues discussed vary, there is a common concern to understand how current changes in educational policy may affect educational practice. "Women, Educational Reform, and the Process of Change" (Rosemary Deem) considers some of the attempts that have been made in Britain to reduce the amount of sexism in education, to offer better and fairer educational routes and experiences for girls, and to decrease gender inequalities within schools. "In/Forming Schooling: Space/Time/Textuality in Cumpulsory State Provided 'Mass' Schooling Systems" (Phillip Corrigan) raises questions against certain dominant forms of theorizing, investigating, and explaining schooling. "The Political Economy of Text Publishing" (Michael Apple) analyzes the production of curricular materials from the perspective of cultural commodities production and consumption. "Parents, Children, and the State" (Miriam E. David) argues that the New Right government in Britain, much like that of the United States, is subtly constructing public economic, social, and educational policies that will radically alter the place of family in the socio-economic system. "Public Education and the Discourse of Crisis, Power, and Vision" (Henry Giroux) argues that public education in the United States faces a dual crisis: a neo-conservative threat to all public spheres and a failure of radical educational discourse to either illuminate the nature of the existing failures of American education or to provide a theoretical discourse for educational reform. (LP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P.G. Altbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Excellence, Reform and Equity in Education:
An International Perspective

Rosemary Deem
The Open University, England

Philip Corrigan
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Michael W. Apple
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Miriam E. David
University of Bristol, England

Henry Giroux
Miami University, Ohio

Edited and with an Introduction by

Gail P. Kelly
State University of New York at Buffalo

Published jointly by

Comparative Education Center
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

and

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto

© Comparative Education Center

First printing: September, 1984

Contents

Foreward — Philip G. Altbach — i

Introduction — Gail P. Kelly — ii

Women, Educational Reform and the Process of Change — Rosemary Deem — 1

In/Forming Schooling: Space/Time/Textuality in Compulsory State Provided "Mass" Schooling Systems — Philip Corrigan — 31

The Political Economy of Text Publishing — Michael W. Apple — 69

Parents, Children and the State — Miriam E. David — 103

Public Education and the Discourse of Crisis, Power and Vision — Henry Giroux — 135

About the Contributors — 175

FOREWARD

This Occasional Paper, the 13th in Comparative Education Center's series, is co-sponsored with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto. The five papers presented in this monograph all deal with aspects of a topic very much under discussion at present--the implications of the criticisms of education and the calls for "excellence" now evident in a number of industrialized nations. The issues discussed here vary but there is a common concern to understand how current changes in educational policy may affect educational practice.

This monograph has its origin in a lecture series co-sponsored by the Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. During the 1983-84 academic year, a number of visiting speakers participated in seminars on both campuses.

At OISE, Professors Paul Olson, Roger Simon and Joseph Farrell coordinated the series, while at SUNY-Buffalo Professors Gail P. Kelly, Ronald Gentile and Patrick Finn were responsible for the activities. This cooperative effort could not have taken place without the support of Dean Hugh Petrie of the Faculty of Educational Studies, SUNY-Buffalo and Dr. Bernard Shapiro, Director of OISE. In Buffalo, Brian Anderson and Cherif Sadki provided needed logistical support. The series was successful and proves that institutional cooperation, in this case across an international border, can enrich the intellectual life at both places.

This Occasional Paper reflects a number of the concerns of the Comparative Education Center in that it deals with key issues of educational theory and practice in a cross-national framework. These papers reflect American, Canadian and British experience.

Philip G. Altbach
Director
Comparative Education Center

Excellence and Reform in Comparative Perspective: An Introduction

Gail P. Kelly

Since World War II the school systems of North America and Western Europe have undergone sweeping changes as schooling has been extended on an unprecedented scale to groups previously outside the purview of the educational system--namely, women, racial and ethnic minorities and the working class. In the 1980s, the reforms of the post-war period were reevaluated in the wake of severe economic recession. In the United States 1983/84 became the years of the commissions on excellence which charged that the schools, which had in theory been concerned with equality, had bred mediocrity which was, in turn, responsible for the economic decline of the early 1980s vis a vis Japan and other countries.

These essays present a critical view of both the reforms of education in the post-war period and the current efforts to reverse some of these reforms in the name of "excellence." The essays here examine the ideological underpinnings of school reforms, the relation of education to the state, and whether and how the post-war reforms have changed either the ideological ramifications of schooling and the relation of education to the broader social context.

The essays start with a common set of assumptions that derived in large part from theories relating education to the division of labor in society and the inequalities that arise from that division based on gender, race, ethnicity and class. The essays ask whether changes in schooling in the past decades either in who went to school or the content of education, has had any effect on existing social relations. The essays here indicate that it is much easier to expand schools than to change what is taught in schools. Deem's paper, for example, shows how British schools, despite attempts to provide equal access to schools for girls, have been unable to bring about equality in how knowledge is distributed within classrooms. She shows the difficulties in changing both what schools teach about women and their roles in society as well as the outcomes of women's education. Philip Corrigan's essay elaborates on how reforms of the past decades have been unable to change the ultimate role of schooling in the reproduction of social relations. He focuses on what has been reformed and, more importantly, what has not been reformed--namely the ways in which schools control space and time.

While many of the essays in this occasional paper focus on the school reform and their limitations, Michael Apple's contribution shows that changing schools and what they teach is not possible unless one changes how school knowledge is controlled and generated. School reforms of the past decade as well as the ones presently proposed have often assumed that the schools control the knowledge they distribute in the formal curriculum. Apple's essay reminds us that this assumption is scarcely warranted. He points out how vague our understanding is of how school texts students read, and therefore the knowledge school distribute, are produced.

While the essays in this monograph focus on how the basic role of schooling in the reproduction of gender, class, ethnic and racial inequality has remained relatively stable despite reforms aimed at expanding the school population and modifying curricula, they do not assume that the broader social context within which schools operate stays constant. Miriam David's contribution directs attention to the ways in which different ideologies within the United States and Great Britain view families, children, and schooling. David shows us that despite the relative stability in class and gender based inequalities in these two countries, the ways in which these inequalities like those of Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain have sought to reconstruct patriarchy through the encouragement of volunteerism and parenting education. Such programs have been directed at moving women out of the work place and back into the household in a period of high unemployment and economic decline. The cutbacks in education have been accompanied by attempts to reconstitute the patriarchical family as a mode of social control.

If the basic social inequalities have remained constant despite efforts to change schooling, what should be the stance of those who have visions of a society in which gender, race, ethnicity and class are not the major determinants of a child's future. Henry Giroux's paper addresses this question. He reminds us that the current spate of reform commissions have focused on how the schools have failed to change social relations. They conclude that asking the schools to bring about social justice is an unwarranted demand, since schools are meant merely to educate. The many American reports on excellence in education have abandoned equality as a goal for the schools; rather as Giroux underscores, they have narrowly defined the schools' role either as producing "educated" individuals or efficiently producing skilled technicians capable of reviving the flagging economy of the United States. Giroux aptly points out that those who have been critical of schools for their part in generating social inequity should take care not to abandon a vision of the school as a transformative institution in the current debates about school reform. Schools may well be one of the few institutions which provide a promise of change in capitalist society.

This monograph is not meant as a definitive statement on school reform in the 1980s. Rather, it is intended to generate debate about what types of reforms are meaningful, the limits of attempting to change schools without changing knowledge infrastructures and the ways in which school knowledge is generated, and the dilemmas which face critical educators as we enter a time in which faith in education has eroded and conservative governments attempt to abrogate reforms of which we were critical but which may have, in retrospect, made the reproduction of inequality through the schools less than perfect.

WOMEN, EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND THE PROCESS OF CHANGE

Rosemary Deem

Even for those groups with access to political and economic power, educational reform is a difficult, lengthy and uncertain process, as a study of the history of advocates for co-education (because it would equalize relationships between the sexes) reveals (Brehony, 1984). Not only the process of implementation, but also the outcomes of policy implementation may display a considerable gulf between rhetoric and reality (Clarke, 1984). Furthermore, educational reformers have often overestimated the extent to which reform of schooling can change society, so that there are quite unrealistic expectations of what those reforms can achieve. For groups who have limited purchase on political and economic power, like women and ethnic minorities, the road towards educational reform can prove a very hazardous and mountainous terrain indeed. What I want to look at in this paper are some of the attempts that have been made in Britain to reduce the amount of sexism in education, to offer better and fairer educational routes and experiences for girls, and to decrease gender inequalities within schools. Arnot (1981) and (1984b) has distinguished between two approaches to gender and schooling, the culturalist and the political economy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

perspective, and whilst critical of both, argues that the latter is preferable because it locates the school in a wider economic and political context, and recognises the structural basis of women's oppression and exploitation in the family, and in the labour market and process, as well as in schooling. This argument is an important one, because as I shall show, it is not possible either to understand the struggles and difficulties, of trying to reduce gender inequalities in British education, or to comprehend why some state policies have taken on the equal opportunities for girls and boys mantle, but not done anything to bring this about, without also taking into account the economic conditions and political climate within which both struggles and policies are located. In addition, it is important to realise that different institutional structures (school, economy, state) have different forms of patriarchal and gender relations, that class relations intersect with these and that those relations themselves are renegotiable and never static (Walker and Barbon 1983, Macdonald 1981), and that hence it is difficult to locate, on a once-and-for all basis, the primary site for the reproduction of gender relations (Arnot 1984b). For instance the Education Group CCCS have argued that 'the key site of the reproduction of patriarchal relations is in the family' (1981, p. 155); others have located it in the school, and some argue that in Britain it is now the Manpower Services Commission (Cole 1984). In fact it seems likely that gender relations are produced and reproduced in all three, as well in the workplace, and that there are important and changing connections between family, school, state institutions and the economy. Hence if educational innovations and practices intended to reduce gender inequalities do not always have the anticipated effects, we must not expect to find the reasons why, solely by analysing the educational system. There may well be similar explanations for both the failure of educational reform to alter gender inequalities and for the difficulties experienced by women in engaging fully in the policy-making system, and in the politics of the workplace. And as Siltanen and Stanworth (1984) note, we cannot hope to explain women's actions and beliefs, or the inequalities they face, solely by reference to their position in the family, although obviously this is one important factor. We have to look at the situations and gender relations women experience in the labour market, in the institutions of the local and central state, and at the benefits men gain from women's subordination (Coyle 1984). At the same time, if educational reform is to be worth undertaking, and I take the view that it is, then we must follow Connell, Ashenden, Kessler and Dowsett (1982) in arguing that 'schools are active and influential producers of educational outcomes' (p. 187) whilst recognizing too that no two schools are ever completely alike.

Educational interventions in the field of gender inequalities

There are many interventions and policies even within the UK which could be explored under this head, and I propose to concentrate on only a few of these; also I am only going to examine those reforms which intentionally set out to reduce gender inequalities, rather than those which might be seen as having unintentionally influenced such inequalities (eq the shift to co-education as a consequence of comprehensivization, see Deem 1984a).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) The Equal Opportunities Commission

The EOC was set up as a body which would concern itself with the implementation of the 1975 Sex Discrimination Act. Even though it is possible for individuals to take to county courts cases of sex discrimination in education, very few such cases have occurred, and not all have had the support of the EOC (eg Whitfield vs Croydon) nor have the judgments had much effect on what happens in schools generally. Hence most of the work of the Commission in education has been in its persuasive rather than its legislative mode, with its publications (ranging from careers advice for schoolgirls to posters on women scientists and materials for use in schools), the organization of conferences and the commissioning or carrying out of small pieces of research as the main features. The Commission has also often intervened by talking or telephoning schools which seem to present particular obstacles to gender equality, as a result of complaints from members of the public. It is of course very hard to measure the effectiveness of the EOC's work but the EOC has laboured under difficult conditions, including lack of money and resources, staff turnover and conflicts, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

has never appointed any real radicals to its senior posts; the Commission has been headed by titled ladies who have the confidence of the Tory government but not much inclination for genuine reform or positive discrimination policies. The present incumbent, Baroness Platt does the job part-time and is even less radical than her predecessor. Of the education conferences put on by the EOC, one of the most popular has been on gender inequalities and boys (rather than girls) and the education of boys has recently begun to receive much attention (Arnot 1984a) although many feminists disapprove of this trend and see it as a regressive step which may lead to boys having an even larger share of resources in education than at present. Because the EOC has no sanctions except the toothless 1975 legislation on sex discrimination it lacks the power to implement any real changes in schools, although clearly it has had some impact on schooling, such as careers advice, and option choices in secondary schools, and has allowed research, and dissemination of information and strategies about reduction of gender inequalities in education. But the EOC illustrates well the problems that may arise when sex discrimination legislation occurs at the end of a period of attitude and ideological change, and is left to be implemented in a less favourable political and economic climate (Deem 1981) without adequate support from other state institutions or sufficient finance.

(ii) The Girls into Science and Technology Project

This is an action research project which has been financed partly by the EOC, and partly by the SSRC, and which has been based in ten mixed comprehensive schools (two were controls, eight were 'action' schools) in Manchester (Kelly 1984). Its main aim has been to encourage more girls to take technology and science subjects other than biology. In the later years of secondary schooling such subjects are usually optional and not often opted for by girls. The research project included a number of different forms of intervention including trying to make teachers and pupils more generally aware of sexism, observation and discussion of classroom teacher-pupil interaction, curriculum development so that science/technology courses contain more of interest to girls, organization of visits to the project schools by women scientists, attempts to influence pupil option choice through talks, films, slides and literature, and some experiments with single-sex after school science/technology clubs. The study has been criticised for accepting an uncritical view of science and technology as 'good subjects' for girls to take, without any real discussion of the connections between those subjects and militarism or other undesirable aspects of modern industrial societies (over prescribing of tranquillisers, technological take-overs of child birth etc). But nevertheless it did represent a genuine attempt to reduce one particular set of gender inequalities in schools, viz the failure of girls to take physics, chemistry and technology subjects in large numbers after the age of 14. It has also been fairly influential in attracting public attention to the issue of girls and science, so that DES publications and even the Secretary of State have paid lip-service at least to the question of why girls don't take science and how this can be remedied. However as Kelly (1984) has pointed out, the research outcomes have been in ways more encouraging and interesting than the action outcomes, with the former giving some insights into how science becomes defined as a masculine subject in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

secondary schools (eg the use of apparatus in a macho way, the association of masculinity with science and science jobs), why girls are often less confident at using science apparatus than male peers, and why so few girls opt for the physical sciences. The action outcomes so far indicate that the action schools have experienced only slightly better science option choices amongst girls than the control schools, and that in physics one control school has had a substantial increase in girls opting for the subject. Amongst younger pupils, differences in attitudes to science between girls and boys have shown a slight change, but obviously it will be some time before it is evident from option choices whether the intervention project has had any lasting impact. The reactions to the results of this project among feminists are interesting, because whilst some denounce it as a waste of time and money, others feel that its effects cannot be measured just in terms of a short time-span at the action schools themselves and that it has at least attracted public and educational interest to the issue, and a third group point to the difficulties inherent in trying to influence a group of state schools themselves undergoing

COPY AVAILABLE

reorganization, at a time when local authorities are cutting educational expenditure and teachers are under threat from a variety of quarters.

(iii) Initiatives by Local Education Authorities

Despite the severe limits imposed on educational speding by central government, LEAs still retain some autonomy over their educational policy and it is apparent that whilst some LEAs have moved a long way at least in recognizing the existence of gender inequalities and the need to reduce these, others have hardly begun to recognize the problem. Actual initiatives have ranged from the establishment of an Equal Opportunities Unit in the Inner London Education Authority, through the setting up of working parties on sexism (Humberside) to reports on gender inequalities in primary schools (Devon) and the issuing of guidelines on what steps schools should take to avoid or reduce gender inequalities (ILEA). Whilst a few local authorities have given teacher advisers some special responsibility for advice on gender inequalities, others have not so far taken this step but hoped that their other initiatives such as workshops, conferences and short courses will have some impact on teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many of the initiatives are very recent, and it is thus fairly difficult to assess the impact they are likely to have. One impression is that whilst advisers, courses, guidelines, can help and do attract those teachers and schools already sympathetic to feminism or to eradicating at least some elements of sexism in schools, they are either not reaching those who are hostile, or just uninterested, or where they are reaching them, as in ILEA, then there is a high degree of opposition and hostility to what is being proposed. Some teachers may feel under attack, others that they are being forced to take up a stance with which they fundamentally disagree, and a third group perceive that they are being subject to 'undue interference' in their professional autonomy (a similar view is taken about peace studies and anti-racist teaching, and was the subject of a debate at the 1983 Conference of the National Association of Headteachers). Also, since schools within an LEA do differ, it is not always possible or easy to influence all those schools with the same broad strategy. Schools in Britain at the present time are simultaneously being asked to take on board a whole range of curriculum and other changes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from education for unemployment and computer literacy, through to the first ever intervention of the government-financed Manpower Services Commission in schools through the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative (which aims to give selected groups of boys and girls aged 14–18 access to technical and pre-employment courses and qualifications in schools and further education colleges; there were 14 schemes approved in 1983, and a further 40 have just been approved). Where individual teachers are influenced by LEA initiatives (and some certainly are) such teachers will often be working in isolation within their particular school, even if theoretically support is available from the adviser, guidelines, or from elsewhere in the authority.

(iv) Initiatives by groups from within the women's movement or by groups of teachers

This group of initiatives differ from the other three in that they have arisen much more spontaneously and sporadically, that there has often been no official or total state backing for such groups (although a London group WEDG has received ILEA finance) and that their work and scope often have to be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

located (through choice or necessity) outside formal political structures. There are really two main kinds of group

a) those who are comprised of both teachers and other interested women and not attached to any particular school or educational establishment eg WEDG in London, the Manchester Women and Education Group, the Sheffield Sexism in Education Group. Activities range from workshops and conferences to publication of regular newsletters, collection and compilation of materials and conducting of research on local schools, teaching practices and the sexism of school textbooks.

b) those which consist of teachers within a given school, which concentrate mainly on trying to change curriculum teaching methods, and attitudes within that school, by monitoring their own and others practices and by drawing teachers attention to problems about gender inequalities (eg girls opting for making jewellry in technology courses, boys not taking foreign languages, girls obtaining few passes in maths exams).

We have already seen some of the difficulties and obstacles faced by other interventions and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attempts at policy changes. For these groups the task is doubly hard because they are often excluded from existing male power structures (women teachers are less often than men teachers amongst the senior management hierarchy of secondary schools) or have only a slight toehold on them, may have often to rely on their own resources or voluntary fund-raising efforts, may have little status inside schools : and little time available to them. Nevertheless as shown by the group of teachers from Bridgewater Hall, Stantonbury Campus School, Milton Keynes (in Deem 1984a) a group can draw attention to areas of discrimination, try to improve its own teaching and use of materials, and try to put forward ideas for curriculum development, although hostility and indifference from other teachers (especially males) is not an unlikely occurrence. Making a fuss about something which happens in a school which is unfair to girls, may not change the offending practice or the attitudes which inform it, but may draw teachers, pupils, parents and governors attention to the problem and at least spark off a debate. Even schools without feminist teachers may sometimes move towards policies and practices which do make a genuine attempt at reducing gender inequalities, as former Deputy Head Stuart Smith (1984) shows for Stamford High School, Tameside, which has experimented with single-sex setting for girls in science and maths, largely because of concern about the poor performance of girls in those two subjects in public examinations. In schools where both feminist teachers and those less committed, but with a practical or pragmatic reason for wanting to improve girls educational experiences can combine, this may offer a wider and firmer power base for change and reform strategies. Other groups in the UK (teacher unions and the wider labour movement) from whom radical changes might stem are relatively inactive locally, despite national activity and statements of intent on equal opportunities. There are of course other developments and statements about gender inequalities which have not been dealt with here, for instance the work of the erstwhile Schools Council, the hugh amount of published work on gender inequalities inside and outside schooling, the emphasis in some DES curriculum documents on 'equal opportunities', the stress in the approved TVEI schemes on making sure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

girls are as well represented as boys, even though early reports on the 14 original schemes indicate that girls may be taking commercial rather than technological courses, and the importance placed on equality of the sexes by the newly-formed School Curriculum Development Council. There is certainly no lack of interest in educational change and reform directed towards ending gender inequalities; but intention and rhetoric are only the preliminary stages; action at strategies and interventions the next stage: initial outcomes of these the third stage, and far reaching and relatively permanent changes in schooling the fourth stage; we are a long way still from stage four, and only in a few places has stage three been substantially reached.

The Obstacles to Educational Reform which would reduce gender inequalities.

There is a long-standing debate in the Sociology of education about the relative autonomy of schools, to which this paper will probably add little (like the domestic labour debate there are many cul-de-sacs but no through routes); but it is a debate which

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

cannot entirely be ignored when discussing educational reform. The extent to which schools and teachers have autonomy is clearly influenced by their structural location and organization. In a relatively decentralised educational system like the one operating in the UK, where local education authorities, individual schools and headteachers are still able to make some of their own policy decisions albeit within social and economic constraints affecting the society as a whole, the possibilities of changing and reforming the whole system from the top are less great than in a highly centralised educational system like the French or Belgian ones, but there are more chances for individuals and groups to effect small-scale changes. When we are talking about trying to reduce inequalities however, whether gender, class or race, we are not dealing with social divisions which necessarily originate or are primarily reproduced in schools. If groups like women who are most affected by such inequalities, are not fully represented in formal power structures or implicated in policy making bodies, partly as a consequence of those same inequalities they are trying to address, then it is not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

only the autonomy of schools which needs to be addressed, but also the extent of women's autonomy from male dominance and the extent of women's consent to, and collusion with, dominant groups and ideology in society. If reforms such as the ones I have described are so far having a relatively limited effect on gender discrimination in education then there are a number of explanations for this (and of course some reforms are very recent)

(i) that the strategies and interventions are poor ones, or the wrong ones

(ii) that the strategies and interactions are inadequately resourced and supported, or too recentto show any outcomes

(iii) that reproduction of gender inequalities is so deeply rooted in other institutions and structures that changing what happens in schools alone will have little effect

(iv) that there are not yet enough women involved in the educational policy-making process to be able to make a sufficient impact on schools and education generally, which is related to the previous point and also to male dominance and power

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(v) that the reforms and changes are taking place in an ideological and economic climate which is highly unfavourable to the kinds of changes and reforms being attempted, and which may also be counterposing the moves made through the use of other strategies.

Of these points, one and two are the least important explanations not because these points are untrue (strategies are under-resourced some are very recent, others may be misguided or inadequately thought out, or insufficiently clear about what it is intended to achieve) but because they do not in themselves explain why a development towards greater gender equality in schools which has at least some official support (however ambivalent) has had so little actual implementation and effect (unlike the moves towards comprehensive schools, also ill-thought out). For example, little has changed in areas like the range and subjects girls take in public examinations, the promotion prospects of women teachers, the treatment of girls in primary schools and the higher education/further education experiences of women, let alone the distribution of women

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

across different sectors of the labour market. Even though participation by women in the British labour force has gone up in the period 1972-1984, much of that increase has been in part time jobs and in areas of employment traditionally entered by women, (Coyle 1984) and the division of labour within the household (which is changing very slowly, and where affected by factors like male unemployment, may undergo only very temporary changes, (Deem 1984c). If we argue, as in point three, that gender inequalities are not just reproduced in the school but elsewhere too, notably in the family and community and reinforced by other structural supports like state social policy on taxation, social security benefits and divorce legislation, this is not as is sometimes argued, tantamount to saying that there is no point in trying to change what happens in schools. But it does point out that strategies for educational change must either seek very limited changes or alternatively demonstrate that women developing those strategies must work in alliance with other groups seeking economic and political change. So for example, it is no good influencing the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

British Labour Party to take up the question of gender inequalities in schools if its other policies and its own organization still reflect male dominance (few women are selected as parliamentary candidates, the party power structure is dominated by men and the Alternative Economic Strategy pays little attention to women's interests or labour-market participation). This more coordinated strategy towards changes in women's position in general has certainly been adopted by only a few sections of the womens movement. But whilst ignoring the existing formal power channels in so doing has been successful on some issues (eg Greenham women's protests over Cruise Missiles) it has not always been helpful on others, and unless more feminists are actually to become involved in the formal political process at all levels then there is little possibility of achieving anything other than very limited goals, whether in the field of education or anywhere else. So for instance, Greenham has had enormous impact on the peace movement and on women; but it has not been able to stop the missiles arriving so point four is crucial. There is of course a danger that feminists will become incorporated and hence less radical if they participate in that formal political process; just as the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teacher unions have capitulated on Manpower Services Commission intervention in schools and colleges which reduces teacher autonomy and turns education into training. But not to participate at all in formal political structures means that women are absent from those places where policy is constructed and implemented, whether in local authorities, senior management hierarchies of secondary schools, or in central government, and that where a few women are present, they are often explicitly anti-feminist (eg Margaret Thatcher). Of course it is important too not to underestimate the difficulties women face in entering largely male power relations. There are many contradictions and inconsistencies in current state policies at the present time, so that whilst the DES talks about equal opportunities in schools for girls, the DHSS continues to discriminate against women in payment of social security benefits. There is central government and ministerial emphasis on the need for mothers not to be employed because their place is in the home, on the importance of 'community care' for the old and the sick (this is often a euphemism for women's unpaid care) and many traditional areas of women's skilled employment are being lost in the recession (Coyle 1984). But at the same time it may be possible for feminists to exploit these contradictions by emphasizing more aspects which are favourable to changes in gender relations and by pointing to instances where such 'official' policy is not being adhered to. However, the possibilities of teachers being involved in radical change in Britain is not high; a majority of teachers voted Tory in the 1983 election. Finally, it is, nevertheless, despite the contradictions referred to, a very difficult historical period in which to attempt collective changes in the position of women in and outside education. The government in power currently is very much wedded to the notion of liberal (in the C19 sense) individualism as opposed to state intervention in people's lives (although actually it has simply changed the forms and modes of intervention - eg the MSC) and is intent on reducing public expenditure on schools and the welfare state, whilst deliberately raising levels of unemployment as a way of keeping control of both inflation and the trade union movement. Williams' (1976) argument that the economy sets limits to what is possible is very much demonstrated by the analysis of the connections between periods of economic growth, social policy and educational policy and opportunities for women, compared with economic recession and what happens to social and educational policy and the position of women then (Deem 1981). The looming prospects of unemployment for many school leavers and the emphasis (even though its been resisted for over a century already) on the need to prepare school pupils for jobs, taken in conjunction with a virtual total cash squeeze on local authority spending, including that devoted to education, does mean that reducing gender inequalities is likely to be seen by many as a low priority. Furthermore the emphasis on changing education rather than the labour market or labour process, in order to enable more leavers to obtain jobs, means that there is little pressure to alter the gender-segregated nature of the labour market or to change hours and conditions of employment, and every incentive to schools and other educational institutions to maintain curriculum and other forms of gender-differentiation, legitimated by reference to the different jobs 'available' for women and men. There may be ways, indeed it is to be hoped that there are ways of altering this economic and political climate, but these ways cannot be found in looking back to the days when working class people automatically voted labour nor in a resort to male-dominated competitive bureaucratic forms of politics, but only by taking into account feminist politics and the very real changes that have occurred in UK working-class-structure and politics. It is very important that teachers, and especially women teachers, participate in the formal political process, so that strategies and interventions for change in education are not either left to those who have only a second-hand appreciation of the need for change or only made possible at the sporadic and isolated levels of individual schools and groups. And it is especially important that we realize the need to develop alliances with other groups working to reform other aspects of society, or many of our efforts to reform education, and to reduce gender inequalities will otherwise be severely limited, or thwarted by the extent to which those inequalities persist and are reproduced in other parts of the social structure. We cannot afford to make again the mistakes made by the early twentieth century proponents of coeducation, who thought that they had found the perfect answer to unequal power relations between the sexes, but in fact perpetrated a type of schooling in which gender differences and divisions were freer to roam than ever before (Brehony 1984).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

ARNOT, M. (1981) 'Culture and political economy : dual perspectives in the sociology of women's education' Educational Analysis 1981, Vol 3, No I, pp 97-116.

ARNOT, M. (1984a) 'How shall we educate our sons' in Deem, R. (ed) Co-education Reconsidered Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

ARNOT, M. (1984b) 'A feminist perspective on the relationship between family life and school life'.

BREHONY, K. (1984) 'Co-education : perspectives and debates in the early twentieth century' in Deem, R. (1984a) Co-education Reconsidered Open University Press.

CCCS, EDUCATION GROUP (1981) Unpopular Education Hutchinson.

CLARKE, J. (1984) 'The politics of secondary school re-organization', unpublished paper given to Politics, Education and Society Group of the Political Studies Association, King's College, The Strand, London WC2. March 1st.

COLE, M. (1984) 'Theorizing contemporary society : the case for an eclectic, pragmatic and practical marxism' paper given to Westhill Sociology of Education Conference, 3-5 January, Birmingham.

CONNELL, R.W., ASHENDEN, D.J., KESSLER, S. and DANSETT, G.W. (1982) Making the difference Allen and Unwin, Sydney, Australia.

COYLE, A. (1984) Redundant Women Women's Press.

DEEM, R. (1981) 'State policy and ideology in the education of women 1944-1980' British Journal of Sociology of Education Vol2 no 2 pp 131-143

DEEM, R. (1984a) Co-education Reconsidered Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

DEEM, R. (1984b) 'Governing schools - power or ritual?' paper given to Politics, Education and Society Seminar Group of Political Studies Association, King's College London. February 9th.

DEEM, R. (1984c) 'Work, leisure and non-employment : shifting boundaries and gender differences' paper given to British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of Bradford, 3rd April.

KELLY, A. (1984) 'Promoting societal change through the schools : the Girls into Science and Technology Project' paper given to Westhill Sociology of Education Conference January 3rd-5th, Birmingham.

MACDONALD, M. (1981) 'Class, gender and education' Units 10 and 11 of Course E353 Society, Education and the State, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

SILTANEN, J. and STANWORTH, M. (1984) (eds) Women in the public sphere Hutchinson.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STANTONBURY CAMPUS (Bridgewater Hall School) Sexism in Education Group (1984) 'The realities of Mixed Schooling' in Deem, R. (1984a) op cit.

SMITH, Stuart (1984) 'Single-sex setting' in Deem, R. (1984a) op cit.

WALKER, S. and BARTON, L. (1983) 'Gender, class and education : a personal view' in *Gender, Class and Education* Falmer Press, Sussex.

WILLIAMS, R. (1976) 'Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory' in Dale, R. et al (eds) *Schooling and Capitalism* RKP pp 202-210.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Glossary of abbreviations

DES	Department of Education and Science
DHSS	Department of Health and Social Security
EOC	Equal Opportunities Commission
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
SSRC	Social Science Research Council now renamed Economic and Social Research Council
TVEI	Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IN/FORMING SCHOOLING: SPACE/TIME/TEXTUALITY IN COMPULSORY STATE PROVIDED "MASS" SCHOOLING SYSTEMS

Philip Corrigan

This paper will also appear in D. Livingstone, ed., Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Power (1985).

INTRODUCTION

In this short sketch I want to mainly raise some questions against certain dominant forms of theorising, investigating, and explaining schooling (predominantly those forms of State provision in advanced capitalist social formations, but some of the points hopefully have more general application to both dominated capitalist formations and to the production of educational experiences in socialist formations). I wish to restore to a more central position an older sociological and historical tradition, that which emphasises how schooling systems are (a) compulsory, (b) State provided and regulated, and (c) have, in general, a "mass" orientation. But although my terms are somewhat abstract, I also wish to begin to make visible the ways in which these "public" structural features are productive of "private" social identities, to restore to more central attention the ways in which schooling is formative of subjectivities. Let me sloganize these two strategic features of this text. (1) Following Poulantzas[2] - Schooling is more than Reproduction plus Resistance! (2) Following others - Schooling does not only teach subjects, it makes subjectivities! What I am trying to suggest here is that attention to the repertoire of the sign system of schooling simultaneously provides us with two features we need to attend to if we are to make sense of contemporary provisions and experiences: the limits of variation that determine the social forms of schooling (an archeology of the "Idea of Education" and its inception by State agencies can be traced in the present) and the buried, profane, fragmentary, diffused struggles around the signs of education (an ethnography of the Body of Schooling and its disciplinary contours, names and boundary-maintenance policing, vitalises the past through a study of the present).

Schooling is and has always been principally "about" moral regulation. Utilising a variety of rhetorics - principally an instrumental version of "Improvement" - the Idea of Education has always been about virtue and value. Some virtues and some values are held to be, that is inflate to occupy the epistemological and linguistic space of the referent, Virtue and Value. Some ways of being human, being social beings, come to stand for what it means to be human (at all), social (in any way). This naturalization, universalisation and making obvious effects two simultaneous displacements and condensations: (1) other different virtues and values produced and sustained by the differential historical experiences of social structural relations are denied for what they are, and are claimed as absences or negations, e.g. ignorance, immorality, or degrading habits. (2) The virtues and values which come to occupy the central space of social power are no longer claimed as specific to one group, but are abstracted to the level of Universal Principles. Contemporary sociologists tend to find the directness (and the intentionality) of this kind of description unpalatable, somewhat crude and conspiratorial. Well, my "position" on conspiracy theories is straightforward: they may well be theoretically untenable as complete descriptions (forgetting the degree to which anyone or any group, making history, always does it in circumstances not of their own choosing) but, unmindful of such delicacies, historical groups frequently do organise and operate intentionally as conspirators! I go much further than this in claiming that it is about time that we began to pay attention to Capitalism's Cultural Revolution.[3] That is, the attempts to remake the world in the self-image of the bourgeoisie first noted by those two young men in the first pamphlet which posed an alternative to that kind of internationalism, written for the Communist League: The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848). But more so the texts of organic intellectuals of the (radical) bourgeoisie tell us this story directly, out of their own mouths - we do not have to impute it (though, and of course, we must never forget contradictions, including unintended consequences!) One theme I want to stress generally is the need to bring into closer collaboration the work of the "new" historians of education[4] with the "new" sociologists of education. In brief: we are talking about the same "Thing" to use my favourite term (from William Cobbett in 1820s England) to signify the formation of the bourgeois State in all its hydra like features. Rather than the once fashionable "Panopticon State" image (which is a metaphor from the side, that is perspective, of the bourgeoisie) I would prefer us to think and feel the "Octopul State", to experience the tentacles and the monstrous qualities of imposition. A Monstrous State and a Barborous Capitalism.

One necessary step in reconceptualising the standard model of the Idea of Education, that which holds it to be "A Good Thing", is to recognise a fundamental illiberalism and violence at the heart of Liberalism (along with recognising some class specific features of Radicalism, also). This coercive institution of specific values and virtues (as if they were what have to count as being human, being modern, above all, being civilised) long predates the inception of the recognisably modern structure of State agencies. Importantly, by the time such agencies are literally built and systematised, the Idea of the State has been transformed.[5] Forms have become neutralised, that is the taken-for-granted means through which alternative ends may be pursued: a kind of institutional rationality has been established. Henceforth debates are about access and control: "more people", in the case of education, should have access to such forms and "more people" should play a part in their administration. This is, significantly, part of a generic shift from problems of politics (which itself becomes a narrowed realm of institutions and relations, principally that of a general right to vote and a narrower exercise of membership) to problems of administration, itself organised through Taylorised forms of bureaucratic control. Questions of power have become displaced to questions of control which, in all their variety, need never make visible, let alone question or challenge, modalities of power - principally the social divisions upon which capitalism rests. Features of this coercive liberalism have entered into much socialism because they have not been attended to by much sociology which may well be connected to the "life situation" of many sociologists for whom choice seems to be a feature of their biography and contemporary context, forgetting their placing as (however junior) State Servants.

Writing in the Westminster Review in 1826, on "The State of the Nation", James Mill exemplifies a dominant tendency[6] of such coercive liberalism

> Those who have observed the workings of human nature upon the greater as well as the smaller scale, are well aware that every class or combination of men have a strong propensity to get up a system of morality for themselves, that is, conformable with their own interests; in other words, to urge upon other men, as good, such lines of conduct as are good for them, whether good or evil to other people.[7]

Eleven years later, in the same journal, the Philosophical Radicals declared

> We advocate, both for England and Ireland, the necessity of a national provision for the moral and industrial training of the young. In the old we cannot hope for much improvement. But the new generation springing up might be modelled to our will.[8]

Modelling implies a model. This sketch is about that model.[9] One central feature of the model is Individualism, but in an active sense: the belief that the "children of other classes" (as the Radical bourgeois intellectuals often said) - by which they meant the children of the aristocracy as well as the children of the working classes - needed to be "freed" from their collective moralities and cultural forms, to be made rational individuals, who could *then* take their place in the "new social order". These relations of dissolution and (re)composition are analogues of the equally protracted dissolution and (re)composition of wider social relations which created (I insist on this) an ideological figure in dominance, *free labour*.[10] This mode of *Individualization* is the basis for all and every theory and practice of *equality*. That is to say, and the point is a crucial one, the (re)composition of the "new social order" takes place amongst individuals, amongst which there is formal equality and whom, it is presumed, have been normalized into accepting a series of rational means for their interactive exchanges. But we suppress at our peril the activity (and it is a war that has not yet been won) to dissolve the other kinds of association, based upon those historical experiences of polarisation (They are not Us) and solidarity (We are all together) which establish alternative visions of how social life might be lived. However weakly, these provide a living critique of current social arrangements, that is the very social forms (including schooling) which it has been and remains part of the class project of the bourgeoisie to establish as neutral, natural, universal and obvious. We had best always think of the *struggle* to individualize. So one aspect of the imposed model involves an extended, protracted struggle to individualise, to place social beings in relation to institutions which appear neutral in their workings, democratic in their management and equitable in their pote[illegible] are the formal institutions of bourgeois civilization (a term I am far happier with than the unqualified "civil society"). *Their* "equality" matches that of the equal individuals "for whom" they are provided. It is true of many formal social institutions that they "serve [concrete, particularistic and group-ascriptive] external demands under the guise of [abstract, universalistic and individual-achieved] independence and neutrality...". That is to say each formal social institution works (and has to *work hard*, daily rather than annually) "to conceal the [actual] social functions it performs so as to perform them more effectively."[11]

But the model extends beyond this general project of social *formation* (with its explicit links to State formation) to that of *socialization*.[12] Inscribed in the original structuration of schooling are images of what it means to be *rational*. Hence the frequent evocation of the ways in which the teacher was to be substitute for the inadequate working class parents, and how teachers themselves had to undergo the transforming experiences of teacher education in those delightfully named "Normal Colleges". They like their "charges" had to be normalized. As J.V. Smith has written:

> ...a new rational culture would require the fashioning of new rational human beings. As it was, the educational reformers operated with a partially explicit "psychology" of the lower orders, a set of assumptions about the way the lower-class mind functioned in its unredeemed condition.[13]

Smith goes on to document the three "major psychological dimensions" ascribed to the working class mind, which parallel the three (in my terms, virtues and values) intended to replace them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) volatility, lack of purpose-------stability, purposefulness
(2) gregarious sociability------------restricted sociability, "private" personality
(3) sensuality, concrete thought------abstract thought, scientific rationality
(roughly: stupidity --------intelligence)

Smith goes on to note the similarities between the right-hand column and certain contemporary theories of "normality" and "intelligence" held by psychologists (and relied upon by sociologists). It is also relevant how the right-hand column forms a code, at once linguistic and practical (to effect changes in mind and body), which is identical with Bernstein's work on linguistic and educational dominant codes over the last twenty or so years.[14] For this reason, if no other, I shall conclude this introductory overview of the area of work that has to be done, of which this preliminary sketch forms a small set of suggestions, by reminding myself and my readers why this kind of investigation is important. Concluding a "brief account" of the sociology of education in 1972, Bernstein welcomes different perspectives, and debates amongst them,

> because these approaches attempt to make explicit the assumptions underlying socialization and their categorical expressions, they temporarily lift the weight of these categories, so that we can see a little how we are, what we are, and inasmuch as they do this, they restore to us a sense of choice and create a notion that it can be different: whether the "it" refers to sociology or society, for in the end the two are the same.[15]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Elementary Forms of Schooling

Most people, most of the time, experience schooling as "dreary tiresome days", as they did in Ontario in 1873 according to Dr. David Fortheringham in his address to the Ontario Educational Association.[16] Most school students or pupils most of the time are silent, or, better, silenced. They are silent because their communicative capacities are regulated by the approved, proper, rewarded occasions for talk and writing. And yet..."noise" (alias "trouble") is also a norm of the hourly, daily, termly, year-in and year-out, historical texture and social forms of schooling.[17] What "happens" in school is part of a more general structuration of expression through the domination of approved and encouraged times, occasions, reasons for talk or performance (and this always in approved and encouraged forms) and disapproval, discouragement or denial of talk at other times as inappropriate; or a more general refusal to accept talk in other than approved forms. Let me be plain, and use the contrasting couplet that constitutes one of the more powerful "sets" in the English language: some talk is Good, most talk is Bad. The texture of schooling turns on this regulation of expression. I am seeking to investigate the procedures and patterns through which some students and pupils come to speak and write effortlessly; how some others do this with difficulty; but how for most, this is not their experience of schooling at all. Is it not time we took these majority experiences of schooling - as active silencing - much, much more seriously? Is it not also time, at least as an hypothesis to be investigated, that we raised the spectre that mass schooling systems were never intended to educate all the children, but were intended to (re) constitute the social identity of a minority and to regulate into confusion, silence, hesitation and resentment the majority of those who have been schooled? And, thirdly, might it not be a possibility - at least thinkable -

that this was indeed the purpose of those organic intellectuals of the radical bourgeoisie who in country after country organised and orchestrated the Idea of Education? If we invert the pattern of discussion of the last twenty years, this would make the so-called "hidden curriculum" (I say "so-called" because it leaps from the page of page after page, volume after volume, of State Servants and other published texts) the explicit project, and the so-called "curriculum" entail a specific differentiation device. This would fit with the analyses of those like Bourdieu and Bernstein in education who have stressed the form-of-the-content(forms of signification, in a different discourse) which exercises a special kind of determination, a specific ascription, which operates as achievement. "Doing well" in the schooling system (like many other formal social institutions) is to know the ruling ecology. Now what is interesting here is that this determination of correct content by the forms of behaviour (writing, speaking, reading, bodily posture, and so on) that are the real, if tacit, rules of assessment and grading, matches perfectly what new teachers also have to learn.[18] What counts as good teaching appears to be about the correct transmission of knowledge (and, of course, paying attention to the fact that any "class" consists of "individuals")[19] but turns out to be about controlling behaviour, being a good "class manager", "retaining discipline", notoriously including surveillance outside the classroom. In both cases forms of the presentation of a certain kind of self, a social identity, appear to in-form and structure the content of what is actually said. Grammar operates to in-form "correct" semantics. The eliciting context of the school rewards correct forms of expression, and ridicules, marginalises, denies, or punishes incorrect forms. We have known for some time how this works in terms of language-codes narrowly defined, but if we widen this to all forms of signification (including bodily features and forms) then we can see it as the general code of the elementary forms of schooling. That is to say, whatever shifts and changes there have been in the last century and a half since State provided mass schooling systems make their appearance as phenomenal forms, they still turn upon and continue to operate through some kind of repertoire of the sort I have been sketching here . Announced as both neutral and knowledge providing agencies, they in fact have always been experienced as transformatory (either constituting "proper" speaking persons, or regulating into silence the majority) and, consequently, regulatory agencies. This in no sense whatsoever denies that schooling makes a difference to specific individuals, in fact, as has been well discussed, their visibly making a difference to individuals has been a valuable (for some!) virtue of schooling. Equality of opportunity is there demonstrated and, simultaneously, those who do not succeed have only themselves (or their families, their communities, their gender, their ethnicity, their anything-else-that-comes-to-mind) to blame.[20]

The meaning of the experiences and range of education has been "stabilised" as schooling, as have the forms of expression which display having been schooled - whether in activities or in certificates. Other social agencies and forms have been "magnetised" by this facticity, this central social visibility - from the Public Library through the producers of multi-volume encyclopedias. A whole range of adjunctive activities are oriented to schooling as The Way To Get Ahead. It is all the more dominant in a period when children are increasingly seen as bearers of futures denied to their parents, a form of social projection "destabilised" by the same children refusing, in some measure, the implied social contract of deferred gratification.[21] That is, increasingly refusing a logic in which their acceptance of subordination or giving obedience now, will yield up superordination and encashable knowledge later. The same circuits identified clearly by Paul Willis[22] through which extra-schooling knowledge rendered schooling irrelevant - also renders the model of waiting (biographical-scheduling) irrelevant. Chronic unemployment, possible nuclear annihilation, systematic examples of State-legitimated criminality, and the sheer incoherence of the current crisis are not contexts which are without their educative effects! The active contradiction here is between the displacement of their own social selves by parents "into" their children which shatters on the double reality of those same children's own historical experience - their parents as what they do not want to be and schooling as a highly negative experience. Both relate to their sources of knowledge outside both school and home, including that set of communicative devices which are too easily dismissed as productive of passivity and trivial facts: television, radio, newspapers and magazines. If schooling experiences are contradictory, so too are experiences of such media.[23]

And because the same social situation is present. The major discovery which unifies the investigations of historians and sociologists of schooling in the last few years involves a major transformation (a significant reversal) of how we should think schooling. Directly we grasp schooling as (1) one form amongst many possible (however hard that is now, this side of the 150 years of its formation), (2) embodying a project of transformation and regulation, and (3) we recognise the range of other cultural forms than the standardised set offered as Virtues and Values, we can see the school as productive through the repertoire of forms it embodies. That is to say, the majority of those who come to schooling arrive with, and continue to relate to, kinds of knowledge and forms of expression which schooling systematically denies, dilutes, downvalues or distorts. With this focus, we can begin to see how schooling hurts (the majority) as well as helps (a minority). In the shaping, through symbolic means, the character of an approved, highly esteemed social identity, violence is being done not only to all individualised students and pupils, but to the other cultures and knowledges (their content and their form) which schooling can only mention - and then usually all the better to inferiorize and marginalize them - but never use. This is because schooling is productive of a commodity, the exchange bargain of the school is preparatory for later exchanges through inscribing in the "educated" commodity-like features which allow their entry into a subsequent educational and occupational structure. This is a far from clean machine and its routines of normalization are productive of active wounds. Schools are places in which cultural production takes place, but one formed through a pacing of product and a grading of result that ensure for the majority their subsequent performance will only be that of audience-member, consumer-citizen. It enshrines knowledge as that which is possessed by the legitimated experts (and the signs of their expertise are, of course, their educational certification). Whilst creativity may well be allowed to "special persons" (although even here questions of marketing and monetary valuation are highly significant), their exceptionality is enshrined in social definitions of what is to count as Culture.

My sense of schooling as structured imposition is not something which has just come into my head, of course. There is a consistent thread of interpretation from the 18th century onwards which draws attention to how schooling works in these sorts of ways. Relatedly, although alternative and oppositional forms may have been delegitimated "out of sight", they persist as the "Not Yet" of the forms which are now so dominant, although perhaps far more flimsily than was the case until ten or so years ago. This persistence of alternative and oppositional forms, even as tacit knowledge, is one reason why schooling systems have to be continuously viewed as engaged on the same sort of project as at the time of their inception . From whence comes this source of their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

difficulty, or "Why hasn't the bourgeoisie won the battle for the hearts and minds?" It seems to me to reside in a certain problem about the project from the start: human beings are sentient and communicative beings. They sense things, they discuss these things, they notice "what is going on", they gossip, spread rumours, have ideas. All of these kinds of communicative acts may be bereft of legitimation, not be accorded the accolade of educational knowledge, not result in Ph.D.s and refereed publications, but they are highly extensive. People experience a variety of social relations which, however vaguely, do not seem quite in accord with the dominant images (the image-repertoire) or knowledges about "Society". These can of course be dismissed, by those who have such thoughts, as their being in error, being mistaken (and part of the long bourgeois cultural revolution I mentioned earlier has been about how to handle and correct certain mistaken ideas held amongst the masses, alas a similar strategy often seems to be held by radical sociologists and some socialists!) but they need not. Such ideas may well be undetectable by even the most sophisticated social survey, participant observation study or any form of inquiry from without. But they do form part of a repertoire of a different knowledge which in a thousand quiet, implicit, prismatic forms does become communicated through particular social relations. It makes up the dense texture of social life, part of a social economy. Given a different eliciting context it can be vocalized, concretized and, above all, acted upon. Now these different textures, these cultural forms, are also in-forming of the social identities of children and young people - even if refusing them, they are refusing something - and acts to afford a different historical experience of space, time and text to that provided by schooling. Although schooling is compulsory, it is not actually total (except for a minority of students at boarding schools, significantly these are either children of the rich or orphaned, criminalised, stigmatized in some way).

Furthermore, role-performance at school need not (or, should not) be read as role-acceptance and, above all, role-internalization.[24] There is a careful wisdom in many an instrumental conformist at school, a careful calibration of the tactical advantage of different behaviours, contrasting expressive forms, for different teaching situations. Children and young adults are far more clever at keeping alive the differences of their knowledge than we often assume.

All of this is considerably under-researched, of course, not least because of that fundamental division between the more mentalist ("Theoretical") accounts, which are highly evaluated, and the more manualist ("Practical") investigations which are seen only to confirm, extend, disconfirm the former. Apart from my own experience of State schooling in London, England, from 1947 through 1960, my main sources here are those who have made the system visible, indicating its lineaments, sinews and tentacles. From those myriad, enlightening and enlivening accounts let me take but two. Jack Common, son of a railway engine driver in Newcastle Upon Tyne, England, in 1938:

> ...school, which is the Council school, is in origin quite alien to working-class life. It does not grow from that life; it is not "our" school in the sense that other schools can be spoken of by the folk of other classes. The government forced them on us...school in working-class life expresses nothing of that life; it is an institution clapped on from above.[25]

Ray Scanlon, 17 years old, Bristol, England, in 1981:

> Schools should teach you to realise yourself, but they don't. They teach you to be a book. It's easy to become a book, but to become yourself you've got to be given various choices and helped to look

> at the choices. You've got to learn that, otherwise you're not prepared for the outside world.[26]

Space

Space directs our attention first to the institutional separation of schooling from the rest of social life. This physical separation is the concern of State agencies which regulate such spaces and compels school attendance within them. Everytime we enter a school it says to us "This is education, this is what it looks like." There are an extensive range of such social architectures which have hardly begun to be analyzed but which "speak" very powerfully, repeating their social purposes, their public natures; within this set, school buildings find their place.[27] In (for example) London, England, from the 1870s through the 1930s school buildings took their place with both comparable social buildings - the workhouse (for the poor), the police station (for the lawbreakers), the town hall, library, and museum (for the public), and churches and chapels (for the righteous) - and, of course, factories. These dominate lithographs, maps and photographs. Modern architectural construction - principally high-rise apartment blocks and office buildings - have tended to diminish the social visibility of these types of buildings (although, significantly, bank buildings are distinctive in both the old and the new socialscapes) but schools still remain boundarised and distinctive. This "setting of limits" was an early concern of State providers. One question asked on the Form of Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, in the early 1840s, in England and Wales, was "What is the nature and height of the fence with which the playground is enclosed?"[28] In my mother's experience, the school gates were locked some short while after the start of the school day and not opened until the end of the school day. Her only way out was to climb the school wall, which she did.

It is important to recall how entrances/exits of schools often provide additional designations. At one of my own primary schools, there were three entrances: at one, BOYS; at the second, GIRLS; and this perpetual puzzlement at the third, INFANTS, MIXED. I wondered then, and often since, what a "mixed infant" was! School names, flags, boards, notifications, and similar paraphenalia of categorisation are all part of the general naming of school space as different and special. But the physical separation is saying something else, it is signifying the important separation of legitimated knowledge and forms of learning from wider social relations - it instructs in the fundamental division between mental and manual forms of labour.[29] Here is learning, knowledge, teaching; in other places are...the rest: work, pleasure, fun, joy, laughter, love. They might say to most 'Abandon (or better, alter) Hope, All Ye Who Enter Here'.

Space also draws our attention to the internal structure of schooling, to the broad classification of different kinds of spaces: rooms for teaching, rooms for other uses, the contrast between school and the significantly named "playground" and also between classroom subjects, and "practical" subjects. School students encounter (and teachers have to enforce) different rules about these different spaces, and who can enter them (supervised or not). Such rooms also work to establish part of the subject identities of the school students, i.e., what they are doing. There is also here an extensive sociology of teachers work which remains to be fully written.

Before moving to consider Time, I want to remind us that such categories are combined in particular ways with generic social effects. If we take Space and Time together we are able to see how schooling helps to define childhood. In England from the 1830s, and a little later in Canada and the U.S.A., the social meaning of age begins to be established with reference to the two realms of schooling and working, but with highly significant consequences for social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

definitions of gender also. The school leaving age begins to be used as the means to establish an age below which people cannot work, cannot work full-time, or cannot work in certain occupations. But these divisions (notably in Factory Legislation) were never simply between adults and children, they were always a tripartite classification:

Children;
Women and Young Persons;
Adult Men[30]

Only the third group were deemed to be fully human, i.e. capable of entering into "free" contracts involving work without State regulation "protecting" them.

Secondly, and from an early point in the relevant history, teachers were declared to stand in the place of parents ("in loco parentis"),[31] an intentional substitution given the analysis of the working class parents and family as inadequate. Later changes were, in part, formed by this idea - with the feminization of teachers at the initial levels; higher levels and overall administration being characteristically in the hands of men. Surrogate mothers thus begin the educational schedule, whilst surrogate fathers typically complete it.[32]

One area of contradiction, conflict and contestation which this alerts us to is the way that different legal and social conceptions of childhood and gender may come into conflict with each other and with the attempt by the school to enforce its domain assumptions. I am thinking here of differences in age based upon school attendance and that drawn from legal definitions of responsibility, for example for voting, for driving a vehicle, sexual relations, marriage, entering into a contract, and so on. If notions of "responsibility" are granted in some areas, they pose problems for the subordinated status granted in schools.

Time

Tracy Atkinson, aged 16, of Newcastle Upon Tyne, England, sums it up well:

> Some people don't like school, 'cos it's so rigid. You start at 9:00 a.m. and leave at 3:30 p.m. You have to do it every day from Monday to Friday. Your only days off are Saturday and Sunday. But it'll be exactly the same when they start work, except that you get paid for going to work, and you don't get paid for going to school.[33]

Whilst Kerry Parkes, aged 21, from Birmingham, England, notes an important difference:

> Teachers should know that they're not going into a job but a way of life - and they're doing it through their own choice . That's the difference between them and kids. Kids are there because they've got to be; teachers are there because they want to be....[34]

Schooling is a compulsory experience. The Law specifies that human beings between certain ages have to attend school (or be provided with educational experiences which the State agencies consider "as good as" State forms). The introduction of State provided schooling systems was quickly followed (if the legislation was not concurrent) by legal requirements that all children attend such schools (or be given an equivalent schooling). The fact of this is of the greatest possible significance for at least three connected reasons: (1) the impact of compulsory attendance was not uniform, what it meant for children and adults, differed as to the familial involvement in production and income earning, and, very significantly, the gender (and sequential placing in the family sibling pattern) of the child; (2) the as yet largely unwritten history of the resistance, by parents and children, to this compulsion has to note the discursive shifts in policy making (and policing) from and through such cate-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

gories as Irregular Attendance, Seasonal Variation, or Early Leaving, to... Truancy and School Phobia (with the State provision of "alternative" schools, Disruptive Pupil Units, and Home-based Schooling); (3) the consequences for the labour process of teachers and the array of other "educational professionals".

Schooling has, then, a temporal insulation which blends with that spatial separation already discussed. The doing of school time separates it out from social time, punctuating and regulating biography and familial relations. Within schooling time, there are patterns:[35] the school day, week, and year. Within this structuration the school day - punctuated with a beginning, many fragmentations and interruptions, and an ending - is the crystallization of the educational schedule. The routinised fragmentation of this educational schedule is a crucial fact which most sociologists ignore. Again, it is the crucial regulative control on the labour process of teachers.

Central to school time is the timetable (taken in its daily or weekly, and its annual - or school year - meanings) the patterning of school organization which brings everything and everybody together. We thus have drawn to our attention, once again, how a human, social construction, a product, can turn into a neutral and natural set of constraints which 'has to be obeyed'. Here the product of our powers acts back, objectified and reified, as the powers of a product. Any "new" activities have to be "fitted in".[36] But beyond the timetable, as a series of concentric waves, are the consequences for what the timetable does not allow: producing all that "extra" work (which is not, at all, extra: without it schooling could not operate) for teachers beyond the scheduled schooling time for which they are paid.[37]

Textuality

Although the two terms of Space and Time have alerted us to the socially constructed features of schooling, we need a third term. By textuality I mean

(1) what is taught, (2) how it is taught, and (3) its social meaning. It has been well argued that there is nothing universal or natural about the bodies of knowledge that come to be taught as school subjects - they are all social constructions with specific histories. Most of them, to adapt Raymond Williams, are selections from an already selective tradition. There is, that is to say, already existing Literature (with a capital L), and History (with a capital H), themselves already particular ways of seeing, showing and saying. These are then never simply selective social bodies of knowledge, they are selecting practices, and it is from these selective practices that the curricula subjects of schooling are made.

Crucial to textuality is the centrality of language, to which I shall return later.

If we assemble Space, Time and Textuality we find they provide us with insights into two sorts of sequencing rules and arrangements - both of which make connections with the educative context, that is with the dominant patterns of social relations. First, if we read across time we find a relating of pupil or student ages to levels of capacity or ability, thus schooling systems tend toward the pyramid shape. That is they become more specialized as to what is studied and more selective as to who can study, as the educational schedule is advanced. Typically "basic" educational provisions are quite general, with more specialised forms coming later in time. Second, if we read across the levels (holding the educational schedule constant) we find that schooling turns on notions of ability. This is either displayed by types of school - as in the post-1944 English tripartite system before comprehensivisation - or by the internal organization of more open, comprehensive schools with the use of tracking, streaming, grading, and setting. In both cases this establishes what school subjects can be studied by which groups, through, frequently, a declaration that certain subjects can only be studied together. Choices around the ages of 12, 13 or 14 can therefore "fix" an educational biography in advance.

Taking my three analytic terms together also alerts us to the much discussed sequence of Curriculum, Pedagogy, Evaluation, Certification, and Occupational Careers. Bernstein and others have argued that we can see in the patterns here how social relations "speak" through an educational knowledge code, and that we can trace significant shifts both in any one social formation over time, or in comparing different formations at the same time. All I want to insist upon is that these shifts are patterned within certain limits of variation given by the code of schooling, that particular "set" of space, time and textuality. This can be seen in two bodies of highly relevant work: studies of assessment[38] and studies of limit cases, or cases which expose the limits of variation, make clear what determination actually is - where schools are closed, teachers are sacked, etc.[39]

But it can also be seen in the relatively generalised (i.e., true of more than one advanced capitalist country) pattern summed up by the twin slogans of "accountability" and "back to basics".[40] This takes various forms, but the central form entails a kind of "fiscal policing" (in my view the main modality of the relation between Capital and State forms in the 1970s,which stands as a shorthand for whole epochs as did the former terms of "moral economy" and "political economy") which simultaneously de-democratizes and conglomerates (or, better, "engrosses" to use a key term from the agrarian revolution which announced capitalism in England in the 17th and 18th centuries) social agencies. This eventuates in the depletion of funding for those agencies. Characteristically such a withdrawal of funds is justified by a necessitarian logic ("What else can we do, its the Crisis") and an appeal to rationality (again!) along the lines of "We can only pay for what we can afford". This "disturbance" of some long established liberal or social-democratic verities is so turbulent that no clear pattern is emerging, but the argument of a "de-schooling from the right" is persuasive.[41] In my experience schools are increasingly being seen for the majority as "warehouses" which "store" students, admitting some to a variety of "skilling" work-oriented agencies (where the domain assumptions are "instruction" and "training") often funded by non-educational State agencies, the best example of which is the Manpower Services Agency in England, Wales, Scotland and the northern part of Ireland. There is also EEC backing. As well as various national or subnational discussions of these issues; that the fact registered at the international level is evident from the 1976 UNESCO conference, The Quality of Work, especially in the anxieties expressed in the International Labour Office submission to that gathering. This discusses "rejection reactions" of young people at work:

> These reactions will lead to rebellion, usually in the insidious form of apathy and passiveness rather than social agitation; to instability, absenteeism and low productivity; and even to bad work and sabotage.[42]

But have we not heard of these "rejection reactions" before? Are they not similar to the problems of schooling? If this should be doubted an examination of the policing literature which works to effect the normalization of the student and pupil (and is not without its effects on teachers' work) would confirm this. My "favourite" example remains Therapies for School Behavior Problems (1981).[43]

At the heart of schooling is language. For this reason I shift my third term from Text to Textuality to mark how this third term is not like the other two, but is the principle way in which schooling presents itself. How texts are textured - their differential this-sided-ness - is what allows us to speak of hidden curriculum invisible pedagogy, differential evaluation, supplementary certification, and so on. Or, in another metaphor, language use is the glue of the school; or the ether through which all else is given weight and shape. It works through those concealed ascriptions, assumptions and expectations, as well as within explicit practices, regulations, rules and categories. Learning any subject is learning a language. Learning a language is learning social relations; learning esteemed, approved and proper expressive forms; understanding obedience, respect, acceptability. For this reason we need much more work on the rules and practices as to what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge . What does it mean to say that X learned well, did well at an examination, did a good Ph.D.? What is at stake is what is proper, acceptable, correct. And behind that are our old acquaintances "Good" and "Bad" - what it means to be Good. What counts as a valid expressive form within schooling is thus intimately connected with, and strongly regulative of, our sense of our social identities.

Schooling, I am arguing, is productive - differentially productive - of subjectivities, or social identities (to use my preferred term). This is what schooling teaches as much, or more, than the subjects we conventionally speak of. Or, better, schooling teaches curricula subjects through and by establishing a range of passable, above all individualized, social identities. Schools have been engendering agencies from the start, this is not a recent phenomenon,[44] just as they have played upon the available social classifications of ethnicity, nationality, region, religion and many others. This "play" though is not, it seems to me, simply that of a "repeater" function for clear and evident social identities (repertoires) beyond the school, the work of confirming and conforming (and, of course, disconfirming and unconforming) is a form of productivity directly connected with the specificity (and relative uniqueness) of the structuration of schooling, its meta-message system, its objectivity.

The majority of students and pupils encounter the language use of the educational knowledge code as Other. Learning the rules of how to perform properly and acceptably is a painful and difficult procedure. Being good at school is being fluent in those language games. Moreover schools sustain certain productivities which are uniquely there and there only. They act generally to symbolize socially what is knowledge, how to learn, what is teaching, and so on. But they also generate a social classification of their own: the famous trinity formula of very able, able, and less able: they establish the importance of knowledgability and stupidity. Taken with the other social classifications, educational schedules pattern out as social destinations, life chances and self identities. Knowing who we are entails some categorization from without...listen to the number of people who say, "Oh, I am only a...."

Turning Textuality[45]

Thus far I have concentrated - as I believe we must - on the shape of the imposed and provided forms of schooling, but this is of course an incomplete story. We need to know - and only this can explain the shape of State forms and allow us to know some thing of their weight - against who and what the State was and is organizing. What, in a word, is being feared? Secondly, the social inflation of one form to "stand for" a range of practices (all others having been delegitimated, repressed, denied, marginalized and so on) does not solve everything. What it does is transplant social contradictions and struggles between different possible social means and ends into a singular institutional framework: the contradictions are now forced into the schooling system. This internalisation does not solve them at all. Reconstructions and reforms of schooling are as attentive to these internal contradictions as they are to any linkages outward from the school, although the rhetoric of "needs" (principally of industry) is often involved to justify internal shifts.

This history of turning textuality (refusing its categories, blunting its force) has yet to be written adequately, it will entail some sense of what I have discussed here, but also an extended historical ethnography of the *variety* of forms in which different groups work with (partly within, partly beyond) the space, time and textuality constraints. How those constraints are never simply constraints, but are - negatively or positively - resources for differential construction.[46] But in those accounts what I want to argue as the *causal texture* has to be taken seriously. Following McHugh and others (but resisting their stress, which is shared too, by Bernstein and others, upon *constituting*, preferring the term regulating)[47] these commonsense understandings of what schools have to be, commonsense versions of cause and effect are subjectively objective. Central to such texture is the idea that if individuals do badly at school it is because they are less able, although "explanations" of their disability will vary.

Conclusion

In trying to establish a perspective upon schooling as *productive*[48] I am also trying to take some distance from a recurrent feature of what I consider *didactic discourses* within the sociology of education (and sociology generally). These tend to produce patterns (descriptive of practices or of other theories) which are structured by "Either/Or" dichotomies, instead of "Both/And". Moreover the former mode of theorizing and pedagogy carries a tacit moral absolutism, that is, it displays the 'new' and 'present' approach as that which "ought to be believed". This confronts students of sociology as an alienated, reified form of knowledge, distinctively closed against their own experiences; that is, to be plain, against the knowledge they already possess, however fragmentary and digressive that may seem.[49] I am expressing an anxiety here about how far the practices within the sociology of education are replications of the relational sets I have been concerned with in the sketch about schooling given here. How many of us have overheard (as I did recently) graduate students saying that when they began the lonely labours of their doctoral research they found they had to use some or other "Keyword" (say, Political Economy) but how they had "recently" realized that they had to erase that phrase and substitute another (say, Cultural Studies)? For that reason I want to conclude by signalling my broad agreement with Jacob's argument for us to turn from "dichotomy to typology" - synthetic and cumulative (hence the need to hold to a history of the present).[50]

Two final points are in order. The great danger of typologies that entail elementary forms is that they remain cruciously 'impertinent' and 'inappropriate' to grasp the concrete content for which they provide (some of) the structuring elements. This is true of a currently dominant expression which some may see as congruent with my own, that of Giddens. I would submit that his formulations systematically obscure historical experience, and rest, residually, upon a unitary conception of social identity. Consider two famous passages, both from Central Problems:[51]

> ...social activity is always constituted in three intersecting moments of difference: temporally, paradigmatically (involving structure which is present in its instantiation) and spatially. All social practices are situated activities in each of these senses. (p. 54)

Later:

> As I shall employ it, 'structure' refers to 'structural property', or more exactly, 'structuring property', structuring properties provide the 'binding' of time and space in social systems. I argue that these properties can best be understood as rules and resources, recursively implicated in the reproduction of social systems. (p. 64)

This gives us "context" and "binding", but is in fact a form of classicism - shape as superinduced - where is content, where is production? Above all, as the first quotation makes clear, difference has become a property (a far from insignificant term) of social structure. But difference is a feature of how these (claimed) structuring properties are themselves embodied, differential time, differential space, differential structuration...What evades this form of representation is precisely what it claims to signify, difference in two distinctive senses. First, the different forms of regulation which precisely establish a structuration (or, a set of structurations) as universal, natural, neutral and obvious - think of the progression from task-time, through clock-time to the scheduling which is so evident in advanced capitalist societies. Think of alphabetization, literacy, speaking, writing... These are not simply structuring media, they precisely (and with violent struggles) mediate difference through the valuation of some forms as if they were the only True, Proper, Appropriate, in a word, Good versions (but even the conception of versions is repressed).

Second, just as the range of possible social forms is dominated by one set, so too are the range of possible social identities. Regulating the social classifications - of what it is to be a human being - of gender, age, language, habitation, familial forms is to marginalise senses of our possible forms of being. So regulation results in a congruency of patterns of both circumstances and selves, this is what I understand normalization to effect, to produce. But, and if this 'but' is refused or erased, I do not know where the resources are to be found for social transformation, we must never confuse dominant patterns with the totality of possible forms. Our task is a difficult one. Paul Feyerabend has expressed it beautifully - and in my view it is through such language, metaphors, tentativeness that we can hold to both a concretization of historical experience and an engagement with the present:

> In my lectures on the theory of knowledge I usually present and discuss the thesis that finding a new theory for given facts is like finding a new production for a well known play.[52]
>
> ...how is one supposed to grasp 'reality' and 'content' when every representation is already tied to the one particular form which makes it possible? By not confusing content with the one form habitually in use. It is not easy to get rid of this confusion.[53]

Looking back over the 150 years of State regulated schooling in England (with its achieved compulsory facticity for only 100 years) it seems that we can find, in the myriad contestations - which like a kaleidoscope have to be 'disturbed' from time to time to find new patterns of meaning - a multiple indeterminacy which could be expressed as the singular lack of success of the project. Given the dichotomous nature of much theorisation (either Schools Reproduce or Students Resist) and the systematic inattention to the attempted formation of fixed subjectivities, it is hardly surprising that central contradictory features have been 'missed'. My own account here runs that risk to. It is perhaps of more than personal interest that we seem only to be able to produce coherence (from the side of the imposed and provided forms; or from the side of the equally extensive consequences, and the 'traces' of alternatives and oppositional forms) at the cost of 'losing' contradictions. This repression effects a kind of disciplining of our discourses, they slide over or shatter upon the objectivities we are trying to present, picture and pattern...the subjectivities we hope to become.

Afterwords:

****

In other words- in the context of the present moment when, once again, education has been placed in the sights, under the microscope, made visible as a central site- all talk of reform and reconstruction has to be addressed with a moral question. To what extent and how rapidly do these changes alter the elementary forms described above? This is a moral question because it is time to recognise as central to education (considered far more widely than schooling, considered indeed as the self-conscious, increasingly co-operative, more and more collective and egalitarian making of human beings as historical subjects) the extensive contradiction between human capacities and social forms. The social form I have indicated here restricts, for the majority, the possibilities of realising human capacities . By the latter term I intend no 'shopping list' of known features since I regard humanity as always-already in the moment of becoming...more alive, more happy, i.e. being more.Only through this historic realization can there be guaranteed a genuine, non-oppressive, non-exploiting having more. [illegible] have therefore to challenge existing theories and practices of both social formation and socialization which claim to be the summit of human achievement, the termination of history. Against the commodity form of rational(mentalist) competing acquisitive individuals (evaluated by certificates which display what they know) we should think of the community form [illegible] embodying different groups actively co-operating and sharing (evaluated by accomplishments which display 'really useful knowledge').

In yet other words, things and people could be different.Human beings are fundamentally historical: the world was made, and therefor can be made differently.The visions and dreams will vary, but they can be summed up with one phrase:Not Yet Satisfied. Imagine.

****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

1. This chapter is dedicated to Basil Bernstein, who first discussed this schema with me 1st June 1982. The worked up material was presented as lectures at the Institute in London and then at OISE, 10th March 1983. I owe much to many others, notably Masters and Doctoral students in London and Toronto; Fiona Paterson, Department of Sociology, University of Edinburgh, Scotland; Dr. Lesley Caldwell, Department of Sociology of Education at the London Institute and Dr. Valerie Walkerdine, Director of the Girls and Mathematics Unit, there.

2. N. Poulantzas, State, Power, Socialism (London: New Left Books, 1978, pp. 28-34). See also: H. Giroux's important article "Theories of Reproduction..." Harvard Educational Review, 53:3 (1983):257-293.

3. P. Corrigan, Capitalism's Cultural Revolution (unpublished, 1979); D. Sayer and P. Corrigan, The Great Arch (Oxford, M. Robertson, 1985); P. Corrigan, Capitalism's Cultural Revolution (London: Macmillan, forthcoming); N. Elias, The Civilizing Process, (Oxford: Blackwell, I:1978; II:1982).

4. Some principal texts would have to be: two comprehensive surveys : H. Silver "Education and the Labour Movement", History of Education 2 (1973) and J. Hurt "Education and the Working Classes", Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History 30 (1975); R. Johnson, "Educational Policy and Social Control in Early Victorian England", Past and Present (49) 1970; J.S. Hurt: Education in Evolution (London:Fontana, 1971); Elementary Schooling and the working classes, 1860-1918 (London: Routledge, 1980); G. Sutherland, Policy-making in Elementary Education, 1870-1895 (Oxford: University Press, 1973); P.H.J.H. Gosden, Education in the Second World War (London: Methuen, 1976); S. Baron and others, Unpopular Education, (London: Hutchinson, 1981)--as a sample for England; A. Prentice, The School Promoters, (Toronto: McClelland & S, 1977); S.Schechter "Capitalism, Class and Educational Reform in Canada" in L. Panitch (ed.) The Canadian State (Toronto: University Press, 1977, Ch. 13); A. Pomfret "Comparative Historical School Change", Canadian Journal of Sociology, 4:3 (1979); (see his Note 1 for a discussion of Anglophone Canadian and United States historiography); M. Katz and P.H. Mattingly (eds), Education and Social Change (New York, 1975) ; B. Curtis "Preconditions of the Canadian State: Educational reform and the construction of a public in Upper Canada, 1837-1846", Studies in Political Economy, 10 (Winter 1983) forAnglophone Canada. Two texts which do try to establish the connections I am arguing for are R. Dale: "From expectations to outcomes in Education Systems", Interchange 12:2-3 (1981); "Education and the Capitalist State" in M. Apple (ed.) Cultural and economic reproduction in Education (London:Routledge, 1982, Ch. 4, esp. pp. 147-48). I have learned much from these and from Roger Dale's other work. See also material referenced in my notes 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 21, 30, 32.

5. Curtis argues "the educational reforms of the 1840s in Upper Canada tran--formed the nature of educational struggle. Very soon after the construction of state educational administration, serious questions about the form of education ceased to be widely posed. The creation of a 'sphere above politics', as Ryerson liked to call the school system, transformed the debate over education from one over competing and conflictual forms of education into one over the management of a state form. The construction

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of a public sphere transforms questions of form into questions of administration. In the process possibilities not contained in the public domain itself tend to vanish" (Op. cit., n. 4, p. 115) . In our pamphlet Class struggle, social literacy and idle time (Brighton, England, J. Noyce, 1978), Val Gillespie and I tried to argue this as a general feature of State formation in the 1830s/1880s period, in England. See Addenda at end of Notes.

6. This forms the main theme of my doctoral thesis, State formation and moral regulation in 19th century Britain (Durham, England, 1977), for more available work, see Brian Harrison, "State intervention and moral reform in 19th century England" in P. Hollis (ed.) Pressure from without (Leeds, Arnold, 1974, Ch. 12) and the work of Paul Richards, The State and the working classes, 1833-1841, Doctoral Thesis, Birmingham, 1975; "R.A. Slaney..." Social History, 4, 1979; "The State and early industrial capitalism", Past and Present 83 (1979); "State formation and class struggle" in P. Corrigan (ed.) Capitalism, State formation and Marxist theory (London: Quartet, New York: Urizen, 1980).

7. J. Mill, "State of the Nation" Westminster Review 6 (1826):255. On the Mills, see B. Mazlish, James and John Stuart Mill (N.Y.:Basic Books, 1975) and the exceptional W. Thomas "James Mill's Politics", Historical Journal 12 (1969) and S.Collini, "Liberalism and the legacy of Mill",Historical Journal 20 (1977). The late Philip Abrams (to whom I would also acknowledge extensive debts) showed brilliantly the filiation and lineages of these currents into a specific 'new liberal' sociology, which was anti-socialist, in his Origins of British Sociology (Chicago: University Press, 1968).

8. Quoted in E. Halevy, The triumph of reform, 1830-1841 (L. Benn, 1950, p. 105, n. 6). Along with the "Educational Idea" goes the "Statistical Idea" (theory and practice) on the latter, see A. J. Cullen, The statistical movement in early Victorian Britain...(Brighton, Harvester, 1975). I document the generality of these "Ideas" amongst major State servants in my doctoral thesis (n. 6 above), for more available sources, see: S.E. Finer, Life and times of Edwin Chadwick (London:Methuen, 1952); B. Martin, "Leonard Horner", International Review of Social History 14 (1969); R.K. Webb, "A Whig Inspector" (H.S. Tremenheere), Journal of Modern History 27, (1955); G. Sutherland (ed.) Studies in the growth of 19th century Government (London:Routledge, 1972) and all the studies of Ryerson.

9. Apart from the references already given above, see: W.H. Humes and H.M. Paterson (eds.) Scottish culture and Scottish education, 1800-1980 (Edinburgh, John Donald, 1982); P. Miller, "Factories, monitorial schools and Jeremy Bentham", Journal of Educational Administration and History 5:2 (1973); K. Jones and K. Williamson, "The Birth of the Schoolroom", Ideology and Consciousness, 6 (1980); J. Henriques and others, Changing the Subject (London, Methuen, 1984).

10. The long history of this other "making" is told in M. Weber, General Economic History (N.Y.:Collier Macmillan, 1961, Part IV) and K. Marx, Capital I (Part VIII in any edition). Here I want to acknowledge the importance of the "correspondence principle" in a different sense to that normally employed. There are, yes, features - principally those of loss of control and boredom - shared between the historical experiences of schooling and of adult social

10. life (not just *paid* work); *and* certain structurations of social identity relating to gender, ethnicity, nationality, occupation, language and region (amongst others) are conformably (to quote James Mill) present in both social settings. But I want to stress two distancing distinctions (1) schools are productive agencies, not merely or mainly reproductive, they are active, not passive, they are theatres of negotiation, discovery, contestation and consensuality; (2) it is time, and on a world scale, to concretize the use of the word "free" as in "free labour". First, labour is "freed" all the better to fix it, join it, with fairly solid chains, to Capital; second, the majority of the world's population have never even had that degree of "freedom". Marx (from 1848), Lenin (from the 1890's), and Mao (from the 1920's) were clear about the class content and social consequences of this "freedom" (P. Corrigan, H. Ramsay, D. Sayer, *For Mao*, L. Macmillan, 1979, pp. 12f, gives the relevant quotations). Children and women have never had the same "freedom" - and were never intended so to have in the very classificatory logic of the new social order of capitalism. It has never been true of a majority of adult males either (P. Corrigan, "Feudal relics or capitalist monuments?" *Sociology*, 11, 1977).

11. P. Bourdieu and J. Passeron, *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (Berkeley Hills, Calif., Sage, 1977, p. 178). P. Corrigan, "On Moral Regulation", *Sociological Review*, 29 , 1981).

12. Madeleine MacDonald Argues: "The analysis of class and gender relations requires, I believe, a theory of 'identity formation'..." M. MacDonald, "Schooling and the reproduction of class and gender relations", in R. Dale and others (eds.) *Politics, Patriarchy and Practice* (Falmer, P. 1981, Ch. 10, p. 163). See also M. MacDonald "Cultural Reproduction: the pedagogy of sexuality", *Screen Education* (32/33) 1980; V. Walkerdine, "Sex, power and pedagogy, "*Screen Education* (38), 1981; J. Henriques and others (op. cit., n. 9 above). I have found K. Danziger, *Socialization* (Penguin Books, 1971) of value. For those who find my remarks purely "historical", I recommend a reading of "Theoretical Framework and Model-Building" being Ch. 3 of J. Porter and others, *Stations and callings: Making it through the school system* (T, NY, L, Methuen, 1982) which, after depicting the child as "he" and "him" and socialization in the most aggressive (and, for me, violent) terms, has another "example" - "less natural but no less obvious" - "the changing role of women" which is indexed by the "present confusion surrounding the adult role of women, for the middle class at least, makes the creation of a self-concept for girls difficult and their aspirations ambivalent..." (p. 27). For a valuable alternative see V. Walkerdine, "It's only natural: rethinking child-centred pedagogy", in A.M. Wolpe and J. Donald (eds), *Is there anyone here from education?* (L. Pluto P, 1983, ch. 9).

13. J.V. Smith, "Manners, moralities and mentalities..." in Humes and Paterson (*op. cit*., n. 9, Ch. 2, pp. 46-47).J.S. Mill made the point succinctly in 1848 in his *Principles of Political Economy*: "The prospect of the future depends on the degree to which they ["the labouring classes"] can be made rational beings". (Penguin reprint edition, 1971, p. 123). In today's *Toronto Sun* Harvey Currell's column "On Education" headed "Classes aren't for propoganda", January 16, 1984) we are told, "We do expect teachers to present all sides of any historical or political question and to teach students to draw intelligent conclusions, based on reason, not emotion". Note also: C. Hill "'Reason' and Reasonableness..." "*British*

13. Journal of Sociology, 20 , 1969 ;S. Lukes, "Some problems about rationality' Archives europeénes de sociologie, 6, 1967.

14. B.B. Bernstein, Class, codes and control, Volumes I-III (L. Routledge, 1971-1977); "Codes, modalities and the process of cultural reproduction", in M. Apple (ed.), Cultural and economic reproduction... (op. cit., n.4 above, Ch. 10). Older work of psychologists like Penelope Leech or Liam Hudson is extremely relevant to understand normalization as a "rigid thinking" and a specific "convergence". There may be connections here with recent work on brain neurological structures, particularly that concerned with Left- and Right-hemisphere differences. Anthony Wilden's recent work has elaborated this in terms of its social implications. Like him, I would note how the desired bourgeois virtues "correspond with" Left-hemisphere emphases, are productive of an analytic, digital logic, and dilutes or denies a dialectical analog logic. Cf. J. Campbell, Grammatical Man, (N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1982); A. Wilden, The Roles are no game: the strategy of communication (L. Routledge, 1984).

15. B. B. Bernstein, "The sociology of education: a brief account" (1972), reprinted in his, Class codes and control (L. Routledge, Rev. ed., 1977, Ch. 7, p. 171).

16. E. Guillet, In the cause of education, (T, University P, 1960) quoted in Stations and Callings (op. cit., n. 12 above, p. 16).

17. M. Hawksworth, Structure and regulation: a case study of teaching... (M. Sc. thesis, University of London, Institute of Education, 1982), P. Woods (ed.), Teacher strategies (L, Croom Helm, 1980); L. Barton and S. Walker (eds.), Schools, teachers and teaching (Flamer, P 1981).

18. M. Hawksworth, M.Sc. thesis (op. cit., n. 17). As S. Ball notes (in "The teaching nexus...", Barton and Walker, op. cit., n. 17, Ch. 9) "Both classroom noise and pupil progress were taken as measures of professional competence..." (p. 173).

19. "The major purpose of a school is to help each student develop his/her potential as an individual and as a contributing, responsible member of society who will think clearly, feel deeply, and act wisely." Paragraph 1.1 of Ministry of Education of Ontario, Ontario Schools: Intermediate and Senior Divisions (T, the Ministry, 1984), see also the "objectives" and the five "certain expectations" and "related responsibilities" in the Ministry's, The Formative Years (T, the Ministry, 1975).

20. But "something" has "happened", some forms of class perspective have been repressed along with the domination of the Idea of Education as "Education for All". In England there has been a shift from the perspective which recognised education, focussed on what were then Elementary Schools (and all that the majority experience could be), as a class system, that is highly selective - street parties would be held to celebrate the Scholarship Boy or Girl, the "exception" who gained access to post-Elementary Schools, to that which individualizes failure. Listening to parental talk is instructive here which announces that a daughter or son is "only" going to a certain school, leaving without public certification, etc. This completes the long reformation begun in the 1830s.

21. This draws upon the work of J. Seabrook: What went wrong? (L, Gollancz, 1978), and Working class childhood (L, Gollancz, 1982) on the generational divide within the working class which may become a structural "fault-line".

22. P. Willis, Learning to Labour (L, Saxon House, 1977, p. 64): "... teaching is a fair exchange - most basically of knowledge for respect, guidance for control...This is the dominant educational paradigm..." I have tried to extend this through a different focus on form with the idea of the shape/weight of this paradigm, as the educational gradient: knowledge always flows outwards and downwards from the legitimated voicing centre, from the singularity to the plurality.

23. P. Corrigan and P. Willis, "Cultural forms and class mediations", Media, Culture and Society, 2, 1980; P. Willis and P. Corrigan, "The orders of experience", Social Text (7), 1983; H. Giroux, Theory and resistance in education (Bergin and Garvey, 1983).

24. P. Willis, "Cultural Production is Different from Cultural Reproduction, is Different from Social Reproduction, is Different from Reproduction." Interchange 12 (2/3), 1981. P. Corrigan (forthcoming), "Role Performance and Rule Following are not Role/Rule acceptance, are not Role/Rule Internalization, are not Role/Rule Domination...are Instrumental, Necessary, Tactical, Serious, Principled."

25. J. Common, Freedom of the Streets (L, Secker, 1938, pp. 60-61). See also Jack Common's Revolt Against an 'Age of Plenty' (Newcastle Upon Tyne, Strongwords, 1980). That "Revolt" is not dead: C. Steedman, The Tidy House (L, Virago, 1982); D. Morley and K. Worpole, The Republic of Letters (L, Comedia, 1982).

26. In R. White and D. Brockington, Tales out of school: consumers' views of British education (L, Routledge, 1983, pp. 21-22). This book should be read by all sociologists of education, as should S. Humphries Hooligans and Rebels (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982).

27. A. King (ed.), Buildings and society (L, Routledge, 1980); F. Inglis, "Nation and community: a landscape and its morality", Sociological Review, 25, 1977; Carlo,G.de "Why/How to build school buildings", Harvard Educational Review, 39, 1970.

28. Quoted at the head of R. Johnson, 1970 (op. cit., n. 4 above)

29. K. Browne, "Schooling, capitalism and the mental/manual division of labour", Sociological Review, 29, 1981.

30. I discuss this extensively in my doctoral thesis cited above; J. Humphries "Protective Legislation...", Feminist Review 7, 1981;

J. Purvis, "The double burden and class and gender in the schooling of working-class girls in 19th century England, 1800-1870", in Barton and Walker (op. cit., n. 17 above); C. Dyehouse, "Towards a 'feminine' curriculum for English schoolgirls...", Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1, 1978; A. Davin: "Imperialism and Motherhood", History Workshop Journal (5), 1978, "'Mind you do as you are told': reading books for Board School girls, 1870-1902', Feminist Review (3), 1979. These classifications work across social institutions, the general slowness of the admission of all males to suffrage and the refusal of votes to women until 1918 (and then with an age differential compared to men) needs careful noting. Full franchise democracy arrived in England, Wales, and Scotland only in the early 1950s with the abolition of certain plural voting rights linked to property (exceptions include the House of Lords and the City of London, not inconsequential residues for the country that is always explaining it is the "Mother" of Parliaments!). For a longer view of the social policing effects of such classification see P. Corrigan and V. Corrigan, "State formation and social policy before 1871," in N. Parry and others (eds.), Social work, welfare, and the State (Leeds, Arnold, 1979).

31. J. Shaw, "In Loco Parentis..." and J. Fitz, "The child as a legal subject" both in R. Dale and others (eds.), Politics, Patriarchy and Practice (Falmer Press, 1981).

32. J. Purvis, "Women and teaching in the 19th century" in Politics, Patriarchy and Practice (op. cit., n. 3[illegible], Ch. 23); F. Widdowson, Going up into the next class: women and elementary teacher training, 1840-1914 (L, Hutchinson, 1983); M. Grumet, "Pedagogy for Patriarchy: the feminization of teaching", Interchange 12 (2/3) 1981; S. Acker, "Women and teaching..." in S. Walker and L. Barton (eds.), Gender, class and education (Falmer, P. 1983, Ch. 8); S. Acker, "No Woman's Land:British Sociology of Education,1960-1979' Sociological Review, 29(1), 1981.

33. Tales out of School, p. 24.

34. Tales out of School, p. 46.

35. R. Dale, "The Use of Time in the School", in G. Esland and others (eds.); The social organization of teaching and learning (Bletchley, Open University, 1972); R. Dale, "Implications of the discovery of the hidden curriculum" in D. Gleeson (ed.), Identity and structure (Nafferton Books, 1977, Ch.3).

36. This objective facticity can be a real barrier to fundamental change, for example, in the "information" schools or Boards may give parents relating to "the problems" of implementation (e.g., of Heritage Language Programs being fully-integrated) the timetable (and the disorganization and disruption the implementation would cause) are made central.

37. S. Hilsum and B.S. Cane, The Teacher's Day (L, National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971).

38. K. Hoskin, "The examination, disciplinary power and rational schooling", History of Education, 8, 1979; T. Broadfoot, "Towards a sociology of assessment", in Barton and Walker, (op. cit., n. 17 above); D. Sattery, Assessment in Schools (Oxford, Blackwell, 1981)

39. R. Dale, "Control Accountability and William Tyndale", and T. Pateman, "Accountability, value and schooling" both in Politics, Patriarchy and Practice (Chs. 19 and 24), but see P. Carspecken and H. Miller, "Parental choice and community control: the case of Croxteth comprehensive", in A.M. Wolpe and J. Donald (op. cit., n. 12 above, Ch. 18).

40. J. Donald, "Green paper: noise of crisis", Screen Education (30) 1979; D.A. Reeder, "A recurring debate: education and industry", in G. Bernbaum (ed.), Schooling in decline (L, Macmillan, 1979); recent issues of Journal of Education and Curriculum Inquiry.

41. P. Wexler and others, "Deschooling by default", Interchange 12 (2/3), 1981.

42. International Labour Office, Young people in their working environment (Geneva, I.L.O., 1977, p. 23); P. Dubois, Sabotage in industry (Penguin Books, 1979); G. Brown, Sabotage: A study in industrial conflict (Nottingham, Spokesman Books, 1977).

43. H.L. Millman and others, Therapies for school behavior problems, (San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1981). It is very tough being "normal": if you are not sanctioned for "Hyperactivity" you will be punished for "Elective Mutism" (this, of course, is the infamous "Dumb Insolence" used in military discipline); if not smashed with "Sloppy Behavior" you'll be caught out by "Compulsive Perfectionist Behavior", and you must be on guard against "Gender Disturbance", whilst avoiding "Masturbation" which is (those old 19th century terms return!) a "Habit Disorder". What this demonstrates is that domination by normalization is domination by a "figure in dominance" (Part of the image-repertoire rather than any ostensively indicated human being(s)). P. Corrigan "On celebrating difference(s)", in D. Robins and others (eds.), Rethinking social inequality (L, Gower Press, 1982).

44. I provide evidence of this in my doctoral thesis, see also Purvis, op. cit., n. 30 above.

45. The sense of 'turn' I am suggesting here is complex - I want to register both the 'turnability' of the disciplines (any form of power, all modalities of control, eventuates in resistance) and the 'turning' quality of the multiple social identities, that is to say, relational resources which can be one of the means through which disciplines are turned. But I want to argue against any split between constraints and constructions, P. Corrigan, "Dichotomy is Contradiction", Sociological Review, 23, 1975; G.M. Sider, "The ties that bind", Social History, 5, 1980. Both 'turnings' (for, recall, I am seeing schooling as doubly productive - of social formation as of social identities) are returns of the repressed sociality of difference. The tendency toward 'totalizing' institutions and 'individualizing' practices of advanced capitalist societies (of modern civilization?) are disrupted by differences, by the irreducability of the Body. Discourses always aim to eradicate the Body, to reduce it to a system of signs. Henceforth we have to ask always about the absence of the Body, as a denial, the absent 'I' is a claim to an absent singular Eye (particular, historical, specific, resourced) that can, simply but very seriously, name without claiming a Knowledge.

46. P. Corrigan, "Dichotomy is Contradiction" (op. cit., n. 45 above); P. Corrigan and D. Sayer, "How the law rules", in B. Fryer and others (eds.), Law, Society, State (L. Croom Helm, 1981); P. Corrigan, H. Ramsay, D. Sayer, "Bolshevism and the USSR", New Left Review (125), 1981; P. Corrigan, "On socialist construction", Journal of Contemporary Asia, 1976; P. Corrigan, "Once again on socialist construction:, Sociological Review, 30 , 1982.

47. P. Corrigan, "On Moral Regulation", Sociological Review, 29 , 1981; this does not deny the importance of the work like H. Mehan "Structuring school structure", Harvard Educational Review, 48, 1978; R. Simon and J. Willinsky, "Behind a high school literacy policy", Journal of Education, 162, 1980. But schooling regulates by a specific valuation of some sets of social relations and some forms of approved public expression as normal. Identities are (re)formed through the subjective objectification of this normalization as a desire to be in those "places" so designated. My main critique of all who see social interactional practices "producing" societies is that they displace the content of the repertoires through which we handle,name, structure, and make these social relations. The regulation of repertoires is what is so crucial to understand how schooling's archaeology is alive in its present.

48. P. Olson, "Labouring to learn", Interchange 12 (2/3) 1981; P. Olson, "Known and understood", in Barton and Walker (op. cit., n. 17 above); Giroux ops.cit. notes 2 and 23 above.

49. "For what is oppressive inour teaching is not, finally, the knowledge or the culture it conveys, but the discursive forms through which we propose them. Since, as I have tried to suggest, this teaching has as its object taken in the inevitability of power, method can only bear on the means of loosening, baffling, or at the very least, of lightening this power. And I am increasingly convinced, both in writing and in teaching, that the fundamental operation of this loosening method is, if one writes, fragmentation, and if one teaches, disgression, or, to put it in a preciously ambiguous word, excursion". R. Barthes, "Lecture" (as Professor at the Collège de France), Oxford Literary Review, 4, 1979, p. 42.

50. J.C. Jacob, "Theories of social and educational inequality..." British Journal of Sociology of Education. 2:1 1981; J.C. Jacob, "Review Essay... of Stations and Callings", Canadian and International Education, 12, 1983.

51. A. Giddens, Central Problems in social theory (L, Macmillan, 1979). Giddens says that his Chapter 6, "Time, Space, Social Change" deals with these issues in some detail. It does not begin to address my criticisms.

52. P. Feyerabend in I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave (eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge (L, Cambridge University P, 1971, p. 228).

53. P. Feyerabend, "Theatre as an instrument for the Critique of Ideology", Inquiry, 10, 1967, p. 304. "Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine..." M. Foucault, "The subject and power", Critical Inquiry, 8, 1982, p. 785.

Addenda to note 5 above: The value of two other papers by Bruce Curtis should be stressed.
'Schoolbooks and the myth of curricular republicanism:the State and Curriculum in Canada West,1820-1850' Histoire Social e/Social History, 16(32), 1983; 'Capitalist development and educational reform' Theory and Society,13,1984.Note also his forthcoming 'The Speller expelled:disciplining the common reader in Canada West,1846-1850' and Keith Hoskins 'Cobwebs to catch flies: writing(and) the child' (Unpublished paper,Department of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, England, UK, January 1984).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF TEXT PUBLISHING

Michael W. Apple

I.

We can talk about culture in two ways, as a lived process, as what Raymond Williams has called a whole way of life, or as a commodity.[1] In the first, we focus on culture as a constitutive social process through which we live our daily lives. In the second, we emphasize the products of culture, the very thingness of the commodities we produce and consume. This distinction can of course be maintained only on an analytic level, since most of what seem to us to be things--like lightbulbs, cars, records, and, in the case of this essay, books--are really part of a larger social process. As Marx, for example, spent years trying to demonstrate, every product is an expression of embodied human labor. Goods and services are relations among people, relations of exploitation often but human relations nevertheless. Turning on a light when you walk into a room is not only using an object, it is also to be involved in an anonymous social relationship with the miner who worked to dig the coal burned to produce the electricity.

This dual nature of culture poses a dilemma for those individuals who are interested in understanding the dynamics of popular and elite culture in our society. It makes studying the dominant cultural products--from films, to books, to television, to music--decidedly slippery, for there are sets of relations behind each of these "things". And these in turn are situated within the larger web of the social and market relations of capitalism.

While there is a danger of falling into economic reductionism, it is essential that we look more closely at this political economy of culture. How do the dynamics of class, gender, and race "determine" cultural production? How is the organization and distribution of culture "mediated" by economic and social structures?[2] What is the relationship between a cultural product--say, a film or a book--and the social relations of its production, accessibility, and consumption? These are not easy questions to deal with. They are not easy in at least two ways. First, the very terms of the language and concepts we use to ask them are notoriously difficult to unpack. That is, words such as determine, mediate, social relations of production, and so on--and the conceptual apparatus that lies behind them--are not at all settled. There is as much contention over their use currently as there has ever been.[3] Thus, it is hard to grapple with the issue of the determination of culture without at the same time being very self-conscious of the tools one is employing to do it with.

Second, and closely related to the first, perhaps because of the theoretical controversies surrounding the topic there have been fewer detailed and large scale empirical investigations of these relations recently than is necessary. While we may have interesting ideological or economic analyses of a television show, film, or book,[4] there are really only a few well designed empirical studies that examine the economics and social relations involved in films and books in general. It is hard to get a global picture because of this.

This lack is a problem in sociological analysis in general; yet it is even more problematic in the field of education. Even though the overt aim of our institutions of schooling has more than a little to do with cultural products and processes, with cultural transmission, it has only been in the last decade or so that the politics and economics of the culture that actually is transmitted in schools has been taken up as a serious research problem. It was almost as if Durkheim and Weber, to say nothing of Marx, had never existed. In the area that has come to be called the sociology of the curriculum, however, steps have been taken to deal with this issue in some very interesting ways. A good deal of progress has in fact been made in understanding whose knowledge is taught and produced in our schools.[5]

While not the only questions with which we should be concerned, it is clear that major curriculum issues are that of content and organization. What should be taught? In what way? Answering these are difficult. For not only does the first, for example, involve some very knotty epistemological issues--What should be granted the status of knowledge?--but it is a politically loaded problem as well. To borrow the language of Pierre Bourdieu and Basil Bernstein, the "cultural capital" of dominant classes and class segments has been considered the most legitimate knowledge.[6] This knowledge, and one's "ability" to deal with it, has served as one mechanism in a complex process in which the economic and cultural reproduction of class, gender and race relations is accomplished. Therefore, the choice of particular content and ways of approaching it in schools is related both to existing relations of domination and to struggles to alter these relations. Not to recognize this is to ignore a wealth of evidence in the United States, England, Australia, France, Sweden, Germany, and elsewhere that links school knowledge--both commodified and lived--to class, gender and race dynamics outside as well as inside our institutions of education.[7]

Even where there is recognition of the political nature of the curriculum, this does not solve all of our problems. The statement that school knowledge has some (admittedly complex) connections to the larger political economy merely restates the issue. It does not in itself answer how these connections operate. Though the ties that link curricula to the inequalities and social struggles of our social formation are very complicated, occasionally research is available that helps illuminate this nexus, even when it may not be overtly aimed at an educational audience. I want to draw on this research to help us begin to uncover some of the connections between curriculum and the larger political economy. The most interesting of this research is about the culture and commerce of publishing. It wants to examine the relationship between how publishing operates internally-- its social relations and composition--and the cultural and economic market it is situated within. What do the social and economic relations within the publishing industry have to do with schools, with the politics of knowledge distribution in education? Perhaps this can be made clearer if we stop and think about the following question.

How is this "legitimate" knowledge made available in schools? By and large it is through something to which we have paid much too little attention--the textbook. Whether we like it or not, the curriculum in most American schools is not defined by courses of study or suggested programs, but by one particular artifact, the standardized, grade level specific text in mathematics, reading, social studies, science (when it is even taught), and so on. The impact of this on the social relations of the classroom is also immense. It is estimated, for example, that 75% of the time elementary and secondary students are in classrooms and 90% of their time on homework is spent with text materials.[8] Yet, even given the ubiquitous character of textbooks, it is one of the things we know least about. While the text dominates curricula at the elementary, secondary, and even college levels, very little critical attention has been paid to the ideological, political, and economic sources of its production, distribution, and reception.[9]

In order to make sense out of this, we need to place the production of curricular materials such as texts back into the larger process of the production of cultural commodities, such as books, in general. There are approximately forty thousand books published each year in the United States.[10] Obviously, these are quite varied, with only a small portion of them being textbooks. Yet, even with this variation, there are certain constants that act on publishers.

We can identify four "major structural conditions" that by and large determine the shape of publishing currently in the United States.

> (1) The industry sells its products--like any commodity--in a market, but a market that, in contrast to that for many other products, is fickle and often uncertain. (2) The industry is decentralized among a number of sectors whose operations bear little resemblance to each other. (3) These operations are characterized by a mixture of modern mass-production methods and craft-like procedures. (4) The industry remains perilously poised between the requirements and restraints of commerce and the responsibilities and obligations that it must bear as a prime guardian of the symbolic culture of the nation. Although the tensions between the claims of commerce and culture seem to us always to have been with book publishing, they have become more acute and salient in the last twenty years.[11]

These conditions are not new phenomena by any means. From the time printing began as an industry, books were pieces of merchandise. They were of course often produced for scholarly or humanistic purposes, but before anything else their prime function was to earn their producers a living. Book production, hence, has historically rested on a foundation where from the outset it was necessary to "find enough capital to start work and then to print only those titles which would satisfy a clientele, and that at a price which would withstand competition." Similar to the marketing of other products, then, finance and costing took an immensely important place in the decisions of publishers and booksellers.[12] Febvre and Martin, in their analysis of the history of book printing in Europe, argue this point exceptionally clearly.

> One fact must not be lost sight of: the printer and the bookseller worked above all and from the beginning for profit. The story of the first joint enterprise, Fust and Schoeffer, proves that. Like their modern counterparts, 15th-century publishers only financed the kind of book they felt would sell enough copies to show a profit in a reasonable time. We should not therefore be surprised to find that the immediate effect of printing was merely to further increase the circulation of those works which had already enjoyed success in manuscript, and often to consign other less popular texts to oblivion. By multiplying books by the hundred and then thousand, [compared to, say, the laborious copying of manuscripts], the press achieved both increased volume and at the same time more rigorous selection.[13]

Drawing upon Pierre Bourdieu's work, we can make a distinction between two types of "capital," symbolic and financial. This enables us to distinguish among the many kinds of publishers one might find. In essence, these two kinds of capital are found in different kinds of markets. Those firms that are more commercial, that are oriented to rapid turnover, quick obsolescence, and to the minimization of risks are following a strategy for the accumulation of financial capital. Such a strategy has a strikingly different perspective on time, as well. It has a short time perspective, one that focuses on a particular group of readers' current interests. In contradistinction to those publishers whose market embodies the interests of finance capital, those firms whose goal is to maximize the accumulation of symbolic capital operate in such a way that their time perspective is longer. Immediate profit is less important. Higher risks may be taken and experimental content and form will find greater acceptance. These publishers are not uninterested in the "logic of profitablility," but long term accumulation is more important. One example is provided by that of Beckett's Waiting For Godot which only sold ten thousand copies in the first five years after its publication in 1952, yet then went on to sell sixty thousand copies as its rate of sales increased yearly by 20%:[14]

This conceptual distinction based on varying kinds of capital does not totally cover the differences among publishers in the kinds of books they publish, however. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, for example, further classify publishers according to the ways in which editors themselves carry out their work. In so doing, they distinguish among trade, or text, or finally the various scholarly monograph, or university presses.

Each of these various labels refers not only to editorial policy. It speaks to a whole array of differences concerning the kind of technology that is employed by the press, the bureaucratic and organizational structures that coordinate and control the day to day work of the company, and the different risks and monetary and marketing policies of each. Each also refers to important differences in relations with authors, in time scheduling, and ultimately in what counts as "success."[15] Behind the commodity, the book, thus indeed stands a whole set of human relations.

These structural differences in organization, technology, and economic and social relations structure the practices of the people involved in producing books. This includes editors, authors, agents, and to a lesser extent sales and marketing personnel. Digging deeper into them also enables us to better understand the political economy of culture. By intergrating analyses of internal decision making processes and external market relations within publishing we can gain a good deal of insight into how particular aspects of popular and elite culture are presented in published form.

Let us set the stage for our further discussion historically. From the period just after the Civil War to the first decade of the twentieth century, fictional books led in the sheer quantity of titles that were published. We can see this if we take one year as an example. In 1886, Publishers Weekly took the nearly 5,000 books published and broke them down into various categories. Those ten categories with the most volumes were: fiction (1,080), law (469), juvenile (458), literary history and miscellaneous (388), theology (377), education and language (275), poetry and drama (220), history (182), medical science (177), and social and political science (174).[16] These data do not account for the many informal political booklets and pamphlets that were published. But who the readership actually was, what the rates of literacy were between particular classes and gender, what the economic conditions of publishing and purchasing were, all of this had an impact on what was published.

These figures are interesting since they have tended to change markedly over the years. Yet it is not just the type of book that is published that is of import historically or currently. Form and content have been subject to the influences of the larger society as well. To take one example, market constraints have often had a profound impact on what gets published and even on what authors will write. Again, certain aspects of fiction writing and publishing offer an interesting case in point. Wendy Griswold's analysis of the manner in which different market positions occupied by various authors and publishers had an impact documents this nicely.

In the 19th century, the topics that European writers were dealing with had a distinct market advantage in the United States due to the oddities of our copyright laws. As Griswold puts it:

> During most of the 19th century, American copyright laws protected citizens or permanent residents of the United States but not foreign authors. The result was that British and other foreign works could be reprinted and sold in the United States without royalties being paid to their authors, while Americans did receive royalty payments. Many interests in the United States benefited from this literary piracy and lobbied to maintain the status quo. (Actually piracy is something of a misnomer,

for the practice was perfectly legal.) The nascent printing industry was kept busy. Publishers made huge profits from reprinting foreign books. Readers had available the best foreign literature at low prices; for example, in 1843 A Christmas Carol sold for 6¢ in the United States and the equivalent of $2.50 in England.[17]

Clearly, such a situation could lead to some rather difficult circumstances for authors. American publishers had little inducement to publish "original native works," since a copyright had to be paid to their authors. The American author was largely left, then, unable to earn his or her living as a fiction writer because they were excluded from the fiction market. This also had an impact on the very content of their writing as well. Since they were discouraged from dealing with subjects already treated in the cheaper editions of European works, American authors often had to stake out a different terrain, areas that were unusual but would still have enough market appeal to convince publishers to publish them.[18]

These influences did not constitute a new phenomenon. In fact, the growth of particular genres and styles of books themselves has been linked closely to similar social forces operating earlier. As Ian Watt and Raymond Williams have argued, the rise of something as common today as the novel is related to changes in political economies and class structures and to the growth of ideologies of individualism, among other things.[19] In the 18th century, for instance, "the rapid expansion of a new audience for literature, the literate middle class, especially the leisured middle class women," also led to novels focusing on "love and marriage, economic individualism, the complexities of modern life, and the possibility of personal morality in a corrupting world." The economic conditions of publishing also changed a good deal. There was a decline in patronage and the growth of the bookseller who combined publishing, printing, and selling together. Authors were often paid by the page. Speed and amount of pages became of no small value, as you would image.[20]

These small examples can give a sense of the historical complexity of the influences on publishing and on its content, readership, and economic realities. Book publishing today lives in the shadow of this past and the social, ideological, and economic conditions that continued their development out of it. This is particularly the case in understanding the commercial and cultural structures involved in the publication of textbooks for schools. An excellent case in point is the production of texts for tertiary level courses. As we shall see, the "culture and commerce" of college and other text production can provide some important insights into how the cultural commodification process works.

II.

While we may think of book publishing as a relatively large industry, by current standards it is actually rather small when compared to other industries. A comparison may be helpful here. The entire book publishing industry with its 65,000 or so employees would rank nearly 40 to 50 positions below a single one of the highest grossing and largest employing American companies. While its total sales in 1980 were approximately $6 billon, and this does in fact sound impressive, in many ways its market is much less certain and is subject to greater economic, political, and ideological contingencies than these large companies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Six billon dollars, though, is still definitely not a pittance. Book publishing is an industry, one that is divided up into a variety of markets. Of the total, $1.2 billon was accounted for by reference books, encyclopedias, and professional books; $1.5 billion came from the elementary, secondary, and college text market; $1 billion was taken in from book clubs and direct mail sales; nearly $6.60 million was accounted for by mass market paperbacks; and finally books intended for the general public--what are called trade books--had a sales level of $1 billion. With its $1.5 billion sales, it is obvious that the textbook market is no small segment of the industry as a whole.[21]

The increasing concentration of power in text publishing has been marked. There has been increased competition recently; but this has been among a smaller number of large firms. The competition has also reduced the propensity to take risks. Instead, many publishers now prefer to expend most of their efforts on a smaller selection of "carefully chosen 'products'."[22]

Perhaps the simplest way to illuminate part of this dynamic is to quote from a major figure in publishing who, after 35 years of involvement in the industry, reflected on the question "How competitive is book publishing?" His answer, succint and speaking paragraphs that remained implicit, was only one word--"Very."[23]

A picture of the nature of the concentration within text publishing can be gained from a few facts. Seventy-five percent of the total sales of college textbooks was controlled by the ten largest text publishers, with 90% accounted for by the top 20. Prentice-Hall, McGraw-Hill, the CBS Publishing Group, and Scott, Foresman--the four--top accounted for

40% of the market.[24] In what is called the "elhi" (elementary and high school) market, the figures are also very revealing. It is estimated that the four largest textbook publishers of these materials account for 32% of the market. The eight largest firms control 53%. And the 20 largest control over 75% of sales.[25] This is no small amount to be sure. Yet concentration does not tell the entire story. Internal qualities concerning who works in these firms, what their backgrounds and characteristics are, and what their working conditions happen to be also play a significant part.

What kind of people make the decisions about college and other texts? Even though many people find their way into publishing in general by accident, as it were, this is even more the case for editors who work in firms that deal with, say, college texts. "Most of them entered publishing simply because they were looking for some sort of a job, and publishing presented itself."[26] But these people are not all equal. Important divisions exist within the houses themselves.

In fact, one thing that recent research makes strikingly clear is the strength of sex-typing in the division of labor in publishing. Women are often found in subsidiary rights and publicity departments. They are often copy editors. While they outnumber men in employment within publishing as a whole, this does not mean that they are usually a powerful overt force. Rather, they tend to largely be hired as "secretaries, assistants, publicists, advertising managers, and occupants of other low- and mid-level positions." Even though there have been a number of women who have moved into important editorial positions in the past few years, by and large women are still not as evident in positions that actually "exercise control over the goals and policy of publishing." In essence, there is something of a dual labor market in publishing. The lower paying, replacable jobs, with less possibility for advancement, are the characteristics of the "female enclaves."[27]

What does this mean for this particular discussion? Nearly 75% of the editors in college text publishing either began their careers as sales personnel or held sales or marketing positions before being promoted to editor.[28] Since there are many fewer women than men who travel around selling college or other level texts or holding positions of authority within sales departments that could lead to upward mobility, this will have an interesting effect both on the people who become editors and on the content of editorial decisions as well.

These facts have important implications. This means that most editorial decisions concerning which texts are to be published--that is, concerning what is to count as legitimate content within particular disciplines that students are to receive as "official knowledge"--are made by individuals who have specific characteristics. These editors will be predominantly male, thereby reproducing patriarchal relations within the firm itself. Second, their general background will complement the existing market structure that dominates text production. Financial capital, short term perspectives, and high profit margins will be seen as major goals.[29] A substantial cultural or educational vision or the concerns associated with strategies based on symbolic capital will necessarily take a back seat, where they exist at all.

The influence of profit, of the power of what they call commerce, in text production is recognized by Coser, Kadushin, and Powell. As they note about college text publishing, the major emphasis is on the production of books for introductory level courses that have high student enrollments. A good deal of attention is paid to the design of the book itself and to marketing strategies that will cause it to be used in these courses.[30] Yet unlike most other kinds of publishing, text publishers define their markets not as the actual reader of the book but the teacher or professor.[31] The purchaser, the student, has little power in this equation, except where it may influence a professor's decision.

Based on the sense of sales potential and on their "regular polling of their markets," a large percentage of college text editors actively search for books. Contacts are made, suggestions given. In essence, it would not be wrong to say that text editors create their own books.[32] This is probably cheaper in the long run.

In the United States it is estimated that the production costs of an introductory text for a college level course is usually between $100,000 and $250,000. Given the fact that text publishers produce a relatively few number of books compared to large publishers of, say, fiction, there is considerable pressure on the editorial staff and others to guarantee that such books sell.[33] For the "elhi" market the sheer amount of money and the risks involved is made visible by the fact that even as of nearly a decade ago, for every $500,000 invested by a publisher in a text 100,000 copies needed to be sold merely to break even.[34]

These conditions will have ramifications on the social relations within the firm besides the patriarchal structure I noted earlier. Staff meetings, meetings with other editors, meetings with marketing and production staff to coordinate the production of a text, and so on, those kinds of activities tend to dominate the life of the text editor. As Coser and his co-authors so nicely phrase it, "text editors practically live in meetings."[35] Hence, text publishing will be much more bureaucratic and will have more formalized decision-making structures. This is partly due to the fact that textbook production is largely a routine process. Formats do not markedly differ from discipline to discipline. And as I mentioned, the focus is primarily on producing a limited number of large sellers at a comparatively high price compared to fiction. Lastly, the emphasis is often on marketing a text with a standard content, that, with revisions and a little bit of luck, will be used for years to come.[36]

All of these elements are heightened even more in one other aspect of text publishing that contributes to bureaucratization and standardization, the orchestrated production of "managed" texts. These are volumes that are usually written by professional writers, with some "guidance" from graduate students and academics, though such volumes often bear the name of a well known professor. Written text and graphics are closely coordinated, as are language and reading levels and an instructor's manual. In many ways, these are books without formal authors. Ghost written under conditions of stringent cost controls, geared to what will sell not necessarily what is most important to know, managed texts have been taking their place in many college classrooms. While the dreams of some publishers that such texts will solve their financial problems have not been totally realized, the managed text is a significant phenomenon and deserves a good deal of critical attention not only at the college level but in elementary and secondary schools as well since the managed text is not at all absent in these areas to say the least.[37]

Even with the difficulty some managed texts have had in making the anticipated high profits, there will probably be more centralized control over writing and over the entire process of publishing material for classroom use. The effect, according to Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, will be "an even greater homogenization of texts at a college level,"[38] something we can expect at the elementary and high school level as well.[39]

These points demonstrate some of the important aspects of day to day life within publishing. With all of the meetings, the planning, the growing sampling of markets, the competition, and so forth, one would expect that this would have a profound impact on the content of volumes. This is the case, but perhaps not quite in the way one might think. We need to be very careful here about assuming that there is simple and overt censorship of material. The process is much more complicated than that. Even though existing research does not go into detail about such things within the college text industry specifically, one can infer what happens from its discussion of censorship in the larger industry.

In the increasingly conglomerate owned publishing field at large, censorship and ideological control as we commonly think of them are less of a problem than might be anticipated. It is not ideological uniformity or some political agenda that accounts for many of the ideas that are ultimately made or not made available to the larger public. Rather, it is the infamous "bottom line" that counts. "Ultimately . . . if there is any censorship, it concerns profitability. Books that are not profitable, no matter what their subject, are not viewed favorably."[40]

This is not an inconsequential concern. In the publishing industry as a whole only three out of every ten books are marginally profitable;

only 30% manage to break even. The remainder lose money.[41] Further, it has become clear that sales of texts in particular have been actually decreasing. If we take as a baseline the years of 1968 to, say, 1976, costs had risen considerably, but sales at a college level had fallen 10%. The same is true for the "elhi" text market; coupled with rising costs was a drop in sales of 11.2%[42] (though this may have changed for the better given recent sales figures). Thus, issues of profit are in fact part of a rational set of choices within corporate logic.

If this is the case for publishing in general and probaby in large part for college text production, is it generalizable to those standardized secondary and, especially, elementary textbooks I pointed to earlier? Are market, profit, and internal relations more important than ideological concerns? Here we must answer that this is so only in part.

The economics and politics of text production is somewhat more complicated when one examines what is produced for sale in our elementary and secondary schools. While there is no official federal government sponsorship of specific curriculum content in the United States in quite the same way as there is in those countries where ministries of education mandate a standard course of study, the structures of a national curriculum are produced by the marketplace and by state intervention in other ways. Perhaps the most important aspect of this is the various models of state adoption now extant.

As many of you know from personal experience, in many states--most often in the southern tier around to the western sun belt--textbooks for use in the major subject areas must be approved by state agencies or committees. Or, they are reviewed and a limited number are selected as recommended for use in schools. If local school districts select material from such an approved list, they are often reimbursed for a significant portion of the purchase cost. Because of this, even where texts are not mandated, there is a good deal to be gained by local schools in a time of economic crisis if they do in fact ultimately choose an approved volume. The cost savings here are obviously not inconsequential.

Yet, it is not only here that the economics of cultural distribution operates. Publishers themselves, simply because of good business practice, must by necessity aim their text publishing practices towards those states with such state adoption policies. The simple fact of getting one's volume on such a list can mean all the difference in a text's profitability. Thus, for instance, sales to California and Texas can account for over 20% of the total sales of any particular book, a considerable percentage in the highly competitive world of elementary and secondary school book publishing and selling. Due to this, the writing, editing, promotion, and general orientation and strategy of such production is quite often aimed toward the goal of guaranteeing a place on the list of state approved material. Since this is the case, the political and ideological climate of these primarily southern states often determines the content and form of the purchased curriculum throughout the rest of the nation. And since a textbook series often takes years to both write and produce and, as I noted earlier, can be very costly when production costs are totalled up, "publishers want assurance of knowing that their school book series will sell before they commit large budgets to these undertakings."[43]

Yet even here the situation is complicated considerably, especially by the fact that agencies of the state apparatus are important sites of ideological struggle. These very conflicts may make it very difficult for publishers to determine a simple reading of the needs of "financial capital." Often, for instance, given the uncertainty of a market, publishers may be loath to make decisions based on the political controversies or "needs" of any one state, especially in highly charged curriculum areas. A good example is provided by the California creationism vs. evolutionism controversy, where a group of "scientific creationists", supported by the political and ideological right, sought to have all social studies and science texts give equal weight to creationist and evolutionary theories.

Even when California's Board of Education, after much agonizing and debate, recommended "editorial qualifications" that were supposed to meet the objections of creationist critics of the textbooks, the framework for text adoption was still very unclear and subject to many different interpretations. Did it require or merely allow discussion of creation theory? Was a series of editorial changes that qualified the discussions of evolution in the existing texts all that was required? Given this ambiguity and the volatility of the issue in which the "winning position" was unclear, publishers "resisted undertaking the more substantial effort of incorporating new information into their materials."[44] In the words of one observer of the process, "Faced with an unclear directive, and one that might be reversed at any moment, publishers were reluctant to invest in change. They eventually yielded to the minor editorial adjustments adopted by the board, but staunchly resisted the requirement that they discuss creation in their social science texts."[45] Both economic and ideological forces enter here in important ways, both between the firms and their markets and undoubtedly within the firms themselves.

Notice what this means if we are to fully understand how specific cultural goods are produced and distributed for our public schools. We would need to unpack the logic of a fairly complicated set of interrelationships. How does the political economy of publishing itself generate particular economic and ideological needs? How and why do publishers respond to the needs of the "public?" Who determines what this "public" is?[46] How do the internal politics of state adoption policies work? What are the processes of selection of people and interests to sit on such committees? How are texts sold at a local level? What is the actual process of text production from the commissioning of a project to revisions and editing to promotion and sales? How and for what reasons are decisions on this made? Only by going into considerable detail on each of these questions can we begin to see how particular groups' cultural capital is commodified and made available (or not made available) in schools throughout the country.[47]

My discussion of the issues of state adoption policies and my raising of the questions above are not meant to imply that all of the material found in our public schools will be simply a reflection of existing cultural and economic inequalities. After all, if texts were totally reliable defenders of the existing ideological, political, and economic order, they would not be such a contentious area currently. Industry and conservative groups have made an issue of what knowledge is now taught in schools precisely because there _are_ progressive elements within curricula and texts.[48] This is partly due to the fact that the authorship of such material is often done by a particular segment of the new petty bourgeoisie with its own largely liberal ideological interests, its own contradictory consciousness, its own elements of what Gramsci might call good and bad sense, ones that will not be identical with those embodied in profit maximization or ideological uniformity. To speak theoretically, there will be relatively autonomous interests in specific cultural values within the groups of authors and editors who work for publishers. These values may be a bit more progessive than one might anticipate from the market structure of text production. This will surely have an impact against total standardization and censorship.[49]

These kinds of issues concerning who writes and edits texts, whether they are totally controlled by the complicated market relations and state policies surrounding text publishing, and what are the contradictory forces at work all clearly need further elaboration. My basic aim has been to demonstrate how recent research on the ways in which culture is commodified can serve as a platform for thinking about some of our own dilemmas as teachers and researchers in education concerned with the dynamics of cultural capital.

III.

So far, I have employed some of the research on book publishing to help understand an issue that is of great import to educators--how and by whom the texts which dominate the curriculum come to be the way they are. As I mentioned at the very outset of this essay, however, we need to see such analyses as constituting a serious contribution to a larger theoretical debate about cultural processes and products as well. In this concluding section, let me try to make this part of my argument about the political economy of culture clear.

External economic and political pressures are not somewhere "out there" in some vague abstraction called the economy. As recent commentators have pursuasively argued, in our soecity hegemonic forms are not often imposed from outside by a small group of corporate owners who sit around each day plotting how to do in workers, women, and people of color. Some of this plotting may go on of course. But just as significant are the routine grounds of our daily decisions, in our homes, stores, offices, and factories. To speak somewhat technically, dominant relations are ongoingly reconstituted by the actions we take and the decisions we make in our own local and small areas of life. Rather than an economy being out there, it is right here. We rebuild it routinely in our social interaction. Rather than ideological domination and the relations of cultural capital being something we have imposed on us from above, we reintegrate them within our everyday discourse merely by following our commonsense needs and desires as we go about making a living, finding entertainment and sustenance, and so on.[50]

These arguments are abstract but they are important to the points I want to make. For while a serious theoretical structure is either absent or is often hidden within the data presented by the research I have drawn upon, a good deal of this research does document some of the claims I made in the above paragraph. As the authors of Books put it in their discussion of why particular decisions are made:

> For the most part, what directly affects an editor's daily routine is not corporate ownership or being one division of a large multi-divisional publishing house. Instead, on a day-to-day basis, editorial behavior is most strongly influenced by the editorial policies of the house and the relationship among departments and personnel within the publishing house or division.[51]

This position may not seem overly consequential, yet its theoretic import is great. Encapsulated within a changing set of market relations which set limits on what is considered rational behavior on the part of its participants, editors and other employees have "relative autonomy." They are partly free to pursue the internal needs of their craft and to follow the logic of the internal demands within the publishing house itself. The past histories of gender, class, and race relations and the actual "local" political economy of publishing set the boundaries within which these decisions are made and in large part determine who will make the decisions. To return to my earlier point about text editors usually having their prior roots in sales, we can see that the internal labor market in text publishing, the ladder upon which career mobility depends, means that sales will be in the forefront ideologically and economically in these firms. "Finance capital" dominates, not only because the economy out there mandates it, but because of the historical connections among mobility patterns within firms, rational decision-making based on external competition, political dynamics, and internal information, and, because of these things, the kinds of discourse which tend to dominate the meetings and conversations among all the people involved within the organizational structure of the text publisher.[52] This kind of analysis makes it more complicated, of course. But surely it is more elegant and more grounded in reality than some of the more mechanistic theories about the economic control of culture that have been a bit too readily accepted. It manages to preserve the efficacy of the economy while granting some autonomy to the internal bureaucratic and biographical structure of individual publishers, while at the same time recognizing the political economy of gendered labor that exists as well.

Many areas remain that I have not focused upon here, of course. Among the most important of these is the alteration in the very technology of publishing. Just as the development and use of print "made possible the growth of literary learning and journals" and thereby helped create the conditions for individual writers and artists to emerge out of the more collective conditions of production that dominated guilds and workshops,[53] so too would one expect that the changes in the technology of text production and the altered social and authorial relations that are evolving from them will also have a serious impact on books. At the very least, given the sexual division of labor in publishing, new technologies can have a large bearing on the deskilling and reskilling of those "female enclaves" I mentioned earlier.[54]

Further, even though I have directed my attention primarily to the "culture and commerce" surrounding the production of one particular cultural commodity--the standarized text used for tertiary and elhi level courses--it still remains an open question as to how exactly the economic and ideological elements I have outlined actually work through some of the largest of all text markets, those found in the elementary and secondary schools. However, in order to go significantly further we clearly need a more adequate theory of the relationship between the political and economic (to say nothing of the cultural) spheres in education. Thus, the state's position as a site for class, race, and gender conflicts, how these struggles are "resolved" within the state apparatus, how publishers respond to these conflicts and resolutions, and ultimately what impact these resolutions or accords have on the questions surrounding officially sponsored texts and knowledge, all of these need considerably more deliberation.[55] Carnoy's and Dale's recent work on the interrelations between education and the state and Offe's analyses of the state's role in negative selection may provide important avenues here.[56]

This points to a significant empirical agenda, as well. What is required now is a long term *and* theoretically and politically grounded ethnographic investigation that follows a curriculum artifact such as a textbook from its writing to its selling (and then to its use). Not only would this be a major contribution to our understanding of the relationship among culture, politics and economy, it is also absolutely essential if we are to act in ways that alter the kinds of knowledge considered legitimate for transmission in our schools.[57] As long as the text dominates curricula, to ignore it as simply not worthy of serious attention is to live in a world divorced from reality.

NOTES

(A briefer version of this paper will appear in Educational Theory.)

1. Raymond Williams, Marxism and Literature (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 19. See also, Michael W. Apple and Lois Weis, eds. Ideology and Practice in Schooling (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983), especially Chapter 1.
2. Janet Wolff, The Social Production of Art (London: Macmillan, 1981), p. 47.
3. I have described this in more detail in Michael W. Apple, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology and the State (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982). For further analysis of this, see Williams, Marxism and Literature, Colin Sumner, Reading Ideologies (New York: Macmillan, 1979), G. A. Cohen, Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defense (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), and Paul Hirst, On Law and Ideology (London: Macmillan, 1979).
4. See Todd Gitlin, "Television's Screens: Hegemony in Transition," in Apple, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. The British journal, Screen, has been in the forefront of such analyses. See also, Will Wright, Sixguns and Society (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975). An even greater number of investigations of literature exist, of course. For representative approaches, see Terry Eagleton, Marxism and Literary Criticism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).
5. Michael W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979). It is important to realize, however, that educational

institutions are not merely engaged in transmission or distribution. They are also primary sites for the production of technical/administrative knowledge. The contradiction between distribution and production is one of the constitutive tensions educational institutions must try to solve, usually unsuccessfully. For arguments about the school's role in the production of cultural capital, see Michael W. Apple, Education and Power (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), especially chapter 2.

6. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1977) and Basil Bernstein, Class, Codes and Control Volume 3 (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977).

7. For an analysis of recent theoretical and empirical work on the connections between education and cultural, economic, and political power, see Apple, Education and Power.

8. Paul Goldstein, Changing the American Schoolbook (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1978), p. 1. On which subjects are taught the most, see John I. Goodland, A Place Called School (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

9. I do not want to ignore the importance of the massive number of textbook analyses that concern themselves with, say, racism and sexism. These are significant, but are usually limited to the question of balance in content, not the relationship between economic and cultural power. Some of the best analyses of the content and form of educational materials can be found in Apple and Weis, eds. Ideology and Practice in Schooling. See also, Sherry Keith, "Politics of

Textbook selection," Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, April 1981.

10. Lewis Coser, Charles Kadushin, and Walter Powell, Books: The Culture and Commerce of Publishing (New York: Basic Books, 1982), p. 3.

11. Ibid, p. 7.

12. Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, The Coming of the Book (London: New Left Books, 1976), p. 109. As Febvre and Martin make clear, however, in the 15th and 16th centuries printers and publishers did act as well as "the protectors of literary men," published daring books, and frequently sheltered authors accused of heresy. See p. 150.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid, p. 44.

15. Ibid, p. 54.

16. Wendy Griswold, "American Character and the American Novel: An Expansion of Reflection Theory in the Sociology of Literature," American Journal of Sociology 86 (January 1981), 742.

17. Ibid, 748.

18. Ibid, 748-49.

19. See Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) and Raymond Williams, The Long Revolution (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961).

20. Griswold, "American Character and the American Novel," 743.

21. Leonard Shatzkin, In Cold Type (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1982), pp. 1-2. For estimated figures for years beyond 1980, see John P. Dessauer, Book Industry Trends, 1982 (New York: Book Industry Study Group, Inc., 1982).

22. Coser, Kadushin and Powell, Books, p. 273. While I shall be focusing on text production here, we should not assume that texts are the only books used in elementary, secondary, and college markets. The expanding market of other material can have a strong influence in publishing decisions. In fact, some mass market paperbacks are clearly prepared with both school and college sales in the forefront of their decisions. Thus, it is not unusual for publishers to produce a volume with very different covers depending on the audience for which it is aimed. See Benjamin M. Compaine, The Book Industry in Transition: An Economic Study of Book Distribution and Marketing (White Plains, New York: Knowledge Industry Publications, 1978), p. 95.

23. Shatzkin, In Cold Type, p. 63.

24. Coser, Kadushin and Powell, Books, p. 273.

25. Goldstein, Changing The American Schoolbook, p. 61.

26. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, Books, p. 100.

27. Ibid, pp. 154-155.

28. Ibid, p. 101.

29. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, however, do report that most editors, no matter what kind of house they work for, tend to be overwhelmingly liberal. Ibid, p. 113.

30. Ibid, p. 30.

31. Ibid, p. 56.

32. Ibid, p. 135.

33. Ibid, p. 56-57.

34. Goldstein, Changing The American Schoolbook, p. 56.

35. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, Books, p. 123.

36. Ibid, p. 190.

37. Keith, "Politics of Textbook Selection," p. 12.

38. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, Books, p. 366.

39. I have disucssed this at greater length in Michael W. Apple, "Curriculum in the Year 2,000: Tensions and Possibilities," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (January 1983), 321-326.

40. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, Books, p. 181.

41. Compaine, The Book Industry in Transition, p. 20.

42. Ibid, pp. 33-34.

43. Keith, "Politics of Textbook Selection," p. 8.

44. Goldstein, Changing the American Schoolbook, p. 47.

45. Ibid, pp. 48-49.

46. For an interesting discussion of how economic needs help determine what counts as the public for which a specific cultural product is aimed, see the treatment of changes in the radio sponsorship of country music in Richard A. Peterson, "The Production of Cultural Change: The Case of Contemporary Country Music," Social Research 45 (Summer 1978), 292-314. See also Paul Di Maggio and Michael Useem, "The Arts in Class Reproduction," in Apple, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, pp. 181-201.

47. I have disucssed the relationship between the commodification process and the dynamics of cultural capital at greater length in Apple, Education and Power.

48. Ibid, especially Chapter 5.

49. A related argument is made in Douglas Kellner, "Network Television and American Society," *Theory and Society* 10 (January 1981), 31-62. See also Philip Wexler, "Structure, Text and Subject: A Critical Sociology of School Knowledge," in Apple, ed. *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*, pp. 275-303.

50. This is discussed in greater detail in Apple, ed. *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*.

51. Coser, Kadushin, and Powell, *Books*, p. 185.

52. Wexler's argument that texts need to be seen as the result of a long process of transformative activity is clearly related here. In essence, what I have been attempting to demonstrate is part of the structure in which such transformations occur and which makes some more likely to occur than others. See Wexler, "Structure, Text and Subject."

53. Wolff, *The Social Production of Art*, p. 36.

54. The relationship among deskilling, reskilling, and the sexual division of labor is treated in more depth in Michael W. Apple, "Work, Gender and Teaching," *Teachers College Record*, 84 (Spring 1983), 611-628. See also David Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

55. See, for example, Apple, *Education and Power*, Roger Dale, Geoff Esland, Ross Furguson, and Madeleine MacDonald, eds. *Education and the State, Volume 1* (Barcombe, England: The Falmer Press, 1981), and Michael W. Apple, "Common Curriculum and State Control," *Discourse* 2 (number 4, 1982), 1-10.

56. I am indebted to Dan Liston for documenting the possible power of Offe's work. See Daniel Liston, "Have We Explained the Relationship Between Curriculum and Capitalism?" Educational Theory, in press, Martin Carnoy, "Education, Economy and the State," in Apple, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, pp. 79-126, and Roger Dale, "Education and The Capitalist State: Contributions and Contradictions," in Apple, ed. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, pp. 127-161.

57. I do not want to imply that what is "transmitted" in schools is necessarily what is in the text. Nor do I want to claim at all that what is taught is wholly "taken in" by students. For analyses of teacher and student rejection, mediation, or transformation of the form and/or content of curriculum, see Paul Willis, Learning to Labour (Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1977), Robert Everhart, Reading, Writing and Resistance (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), Michael W. Apple, "Work, Gender, and Teaching," and the chapters by Linda McNeil, Andrew Gitlin, and Lois Weis, in Apple and Weis, eds. Ideology and Practice in Schooling.

PARENTS, CHILDREN AND THE STATE

Miriam E. David

The "family" is all the vogue in much contemporary social thought. It is the New Right's notions of the family that need to be carefully unpicked and criticised because they have implications for both public and private social relationships, between parents and children, between families and social agencies such as family centres and schools, between families and economic organisations. Their notions are not just ideological but underpin their social and economic policies which define clearly and carefully the positions of men and women. In this paper, I want to argue that the New Right government in Britain, rather like that of the US, is subtly constructing public policies - economic, social and educational - that will radically alter the place of the family in the socio-economic system. These policies aim to affect the way we rear our children both in the so-called private family and in the public world of child care and schools. A special place for parents, especially women as mothers, is being recreated, through a variety of strategies that I would like to elucidate. Ideas about the family are not confined to social policies alone but also to economic policies too. Both allot a bigger role to the "private" family for its own general well-being. In so doing the New Right draws on particular moral values to justify its approach, not just values of liberty and freedom from government coercion, but values about sexual morality, too. In this respect, religious ideas especially forms of Christianity, have pride of place. Religious organisations, often called voluntary bodies, are to make a special contribution.

The task of revealing the notions of the family embedded in public policies is particularly urgent. The aims, and the likely effects, are to transform social and sexual relationships, to modify class and ethnic inequalities, and to consolidate inequalities in the relationships between men and women. Women's lives as teenagers, mothers and as carers or teachers are to be constricted. Indeed, women as mothers rather than as others, are used as the main vehicle for economic revitalisation. In teasing out the aims and effects, we need to think through an alternate vision which will not be so constricting for women. The present vision confines women again to their traditional place in the family, in the home as carers and rearers of children either unpaid as mothers and volunteers or low paid in conventional forms of female employment such as childminders, nursery workers, teachers.

So far, the Left have produced no more appealing vision than the Right. Indeed real comprehensive strategies for mothers and child care are curiously lacking on the Left. The New Right's vision, as Campbell puts it, is addressing women as women:

> "The Right is simplistically positive about women's caring role in domestic life and carelessly cavalier about its conditions... In Tory ideology private space is safe, public space is dangerous: the home becomes people's last line of defence. The representative Right has plenty to say about women's fears. The liberal left doesn't. But while seeming to address women's fears, the Right is only mobilizing panics about marauding masulinity for its promotion of private security as the best insurance against public disorder...The ideology appears to address women as women. They've moved in where Labour fears to treat." (Beatrix Campbell, 1984, "How the Other Half Lives" Marxism Today April, p.20)

The Left has not addressed adequately women's social position focussing only on economic matters. Even feminists have fought shy of constructing a clear vision of the complex relationships between men, women and children. They have confined themselves to develop- more satisfactory private relationships, such as "shared parenting". Riley is very critical of this:

> "'Shared parenting' cannot take over a great deal of rhetorical space in feminist socialist ambitions for the future of the family... it rests on private goodwill; but private goodwill cannot be relied on to sustain a whole politics..." (Denise Riley, 1983, "The Serious Burdens of Love" in L. Segal (ed.) What is to be done about the Family? Penguin, p. 152-5)

Other feminist solutions have focussed, along with general left strategies, on "economic freedom for women", meaning employment opportunities, and for mothers, day care facilities especially for preschool children. This public policy solution tends to ignore the ways in which child care overflows into all aspects of public and private life.

> "Day care is a crucial ingredient in a view of women's liberation that focusses on "integrating" present economic structures. It does not simply propose that women should have equal child-rearing responsibilities with men...but...that women should have no greater child-rearing responsibilities than do men in our present society. Day care, in effect, would fulfill the functions women present fill" (Margaret O'Brien Steinfels, 1976, Who's Minding the Children? Torchbooks, p.26)

A solution to family relationships which only deals with either the public or private dimension cannot be adequate. But as Nava points out so well, both feminists and socialists have been slow to develop a comprehensive vision:

> "The assertion that family change was political implied a substantial reassessment of what, for socialists, counted as politics" (Mica Nava, 1983, "From Utopian to Scientific Feminism? Early Feminist Critiques of the Family" in L. Segal (ed.) What is to be done about the Family Penguin, p. 71)

The New Right has not been shy in its reassessment of what counts as politics and has tackled head on "family change". Indeed, it has used this as a basis for criticising previous Left governments and has blamed them for having failed to provide satisfactory private relationships and public institutions. But it lays the blame for changes in the socio-economic system at the wrong door. Left administrations did not adequately address these questions and left a political space that the New Right has been quick to exploit. It has seized upon issues that feminists were addressing but not putting on to the political agenda. Of course some feminists can be erroneously confused with left or liberal administrations when they both have argued for equal rights strategies. But it is the more personal questions, not addressed by strategies to achieve equality of opportunity, that feminists raise that have the appeal. These are the questions of the sexual relationships between men and women, and intimate relationships between women and children. Feminists have argued that "the personal is political" but it is the New Right that has transformed these personal questions into major political issues and placed them centre stage on the policy agenda.

The New Right has tackled the question of the "family" because of major social and demographic changes in advanced capitalism. But these changes have occurred not because of the policies of previous Left governments, but rather despite their inaction. Mike Davis, for example, in assessing the socio-economic changes in the US argues that they are a result of the changing balance of forces in the international political economy in the post-war period. (Davis, 1984, "The Political Economy of Late Imperial America" New Left Review 143, Jan-Feb) Davis is pointing toward changes in the class structure, to what he calls an "hourglass", with a narrow middle strata and an increasing proportion of very rich and very poor. What is more significant is the changed location of women in the class structure, and what might be called a transformed sex structure. The most important point is to note the decline of what Zillah Eisenstein, also discussing the USA, calls the "traditional patriarchal nuclear family". (Zillah Eisenstein, 1982, "The Sexual Politics of the New Right: Understanding the Crisis of Liberalism for the 1980s" Signs, Journal of Women and Culture vol 7, no.3, p. 568).

In Britain, what is regarded as the conventional family and the ideal to which to aspire is no longer the norm. As the Study Commission on the Family puts it:

> "the proportion of all families which might be regarded as typical, that is a married couple with dependent children, has declined from 38% in 1961 to 32% in 1980..."
> (Study Commission on the Family, 1983, Families in the Future, p. 10)

Even in these families, many of the women will be in paid employment since 52% of mothers with dependent children work for money. People seem to be taking the fact of marriage less seriously, since more men and women live together without it. Most people still get married, but one in every three marriages ends in divorce. Almost 60% of divorces involve dependent children, a quarter of whom are under five. One and a half million children in Britain lived in one parent families in 1980; many others had a period in such a family during their childhood. Many then moved into reconstituted families, since 80% of those who divorce under the age of 30 remarry within five years, and often divorce again. (ibid, p.11-14)

> "In 1982 about a third (29 thousand) of all illegitimate births in England and Wales were to mothers aged under twenty. For the first time (at least in the recent past), illegitimate births actually outnumbered legitimate births (27 thousand) to mothers in this age group. Many of these illegitimate births are jointly registered by both parents... (Social Trends 14, HMSO 1984, p.38)

In fact, almost half of these young unmarried mothers, registered the child in the father's name, too. The trends for illegitimate births are even greater for women aged 20 to 24 since it is double the increase for teenage mothers, which itself was 50% between 1977 and 1983. The total number of illegitimate births of 100,000 in 1983 is the highest ever, and nearly double the figure for 1977. (Live Births during 1983 by Mothers' Age, Legitimacy and Birth Order, OPCS Monitor FMI 84/4, OPCS quoted in New Society, 14 June 1984, p. 443)

The changes in the family are complex. Mothers bear fewer children and more families consist of a single parent with a child or couple of children. In Britain, at any one time one parent families constitute over 5% of all households. (Lesley Rimmer, 1981, p.62) Indeed, in 1979, less than 90% of the under-five year olds lived in a household with both natural parents. The numbers of children living in one parent families increases as the children get older so that of all children under the age of 16, 9% are living with a lone mother.

In the USA the growth in female headed households has been even more dramatic. The vast majority of such families are poor, either because they are dependent upon social benefits or minimum wage level jobs. Eisenstein has argued that this constitutes "the feminization of poverty" (op cit.) Ehrenreich has also noted the trends, states:"In 1980 two out of three adults who fit the federal definition of poverty are women, and more than half the families defined as poor were maintained by single women." She then cites a report by the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity published in 1981:

> "All other things being equal, if the proportion of the poor in female householder families were to continue to increase at the same rate as it did from 1967 to 1978, the poverty population would be composed solely of women and children before the year 2000" (Barbara Ehrenreich, 1983, The Hearts of Men Anchor Press, Doubleday, p. 172).

Although the figures for Britain are not nearly as stark, the fast-growing households are those containing lone mothers, and they rank, too, disproportionately among the poor, along with poor single female households of the elderly. Land suggests:

> "Over half of lone mothers are dependent on supplementary benefit /welfare/ because the combination of lack of suitable child care facilities and their low earning capacity makes taking paid work, even if they can find it, an option which leaves them financially little better off than relying on state benefits. In other words lone mothers and their children are likely to be poor with all the disadvantages which that brings. (Hilary Land, 1983, "Poverty and Gender: the Distribution of Resources Within the Family" in Brown, M. (ed.) The Structure of Disadvantage, Heinemann, 1983, p. 70).

The changes in the family are not only complex. They often appear contradictory. Most families are smaller than the norm in the past, but many one parent families do not remain so for long. There are more family "corporations", combines or networks of step-parents, step-siblings, half-siblings and so on, as well as more likelihood that great grandparents and grandparents are involved in the family "network":

> "The immense diversity of situations experienced by children is...obvious...There is an enormous number of different family worlds in which they may grow up...Of particular interest are the changes of environment for the child whose parents have divorced or remarried. Such families are often 'corporations' including a mixture of adults and children from two families... Through stressing the role of the parents, one ends up forgetting about all the others, as if the majority of families consisted just of one couple and their children. Certainly, this is the majority situation, in the sense that it applies to a great number of children, but a good number of other situations exist alongside it."
> (CERI, Caring for Children, OECD, 1982, p. 19-20)

The New Right in putting forward policies for the 'family' is clearly dealing with a most pressing social issue. Families are clearly not what they once appeared to be. As Eichler has put it (1983, Families in Canada Today, Gage, p. 26): "These changes are touching the very basis of our definitions of self and others." The way that the New Right is dealing with these changed social and economic circumstances of families is to try to reverse them. It is trying to reinstate the "typical" or "ideal" family to the place of honour it apparently once held.

What makes the Thatcher government into a party dubbed the New Right rather than a party dubbed the Old Right is the way in which it tackles these new social questions. It brings together in a new synthesis both traditional Tory values of liberty and economic individualism and conservative notions of authority and sexual morality.

> "Thatcherite populism...combines the resonant themes of organic Toryism - nation, family, duty, authority, standards, traditionalism - with the aggressive themes of a neo-liberalism - self-interest, competitive individualism, anti-statism. (Stuart Hall, 1983, "The Great Moving Right Show" in S. Hall and M. Jacques (ed.) The Politics of Thatcherism, p. 29).

Stuart Hall sees both strands of Toryism - neo-Conservatism and neo-liberalism - as equally present in current Thatcherism. So, too, does Jacques. He argues:

> "The precise character of Thatcherism is complex. Two clear elements, however, can be pinpointed. Firstly, there is a strong emphasis on a more traditional, arguably petty bourgeois ideology - the virtues of the market, competition, elitism, individual initiative, the iniquities of state intervention and bureaucracy...Secondly, Thatcherism has successfully attempted to organise the diverse forces of the "backlash"...in favour of an essentially repressive and conservative solution, embracing such themes as authority, law and order, patriotism, national unity, the family and individual freedom...Thatcherism thus combines a neo-liberal economic strategy with reactionary and authoritarian populism (M. Jacques, 1983, "Thatcherism - Breaking Out of the Impasse" in ibid, p. 53)

Gamble, however, goes further in noting the innovatory character of Thatcherism:

> "The real innovation of Thatcherism is the way it has linked traditional Conservative concern with the basis of authority in social institutions and the importance of internal order and external security, with a new emphasis upon reestablishing free markets and extending market criteria into new fields" (Andrew Gamble, 1983, "Thatcherism and Conservative Politics" in ibid, p. 121.)

Despite noting the two strands of neo-liberalism and neo-Conservatism, these writers do not pay much attention to the ways in which the unique combination impinges on family relationships. Edgar, in a most illuminating article, has made this point much more forecfully. He has argued that the social authoritarian Conservatives have dominated in Thatcher ideology and that the neo-liberals, by contrast, have a reduced influence. As illustration, he mentions that the Free Nation, the journal of the National Association for Freedom (NAFF), founded in 1975 to bring together various economic liberals:

> "announced that it was no longer primarily concerned with the analysis and exposure of the political forces currently threatening our freedom' but rather with 'rising crime, sexual permissiveness and family breakdown', quoting the quintessential Tory patriarch, Edmund Burke in support."

Edgar goes on to argue:

> "So by early 1983 the authoritarian right seemed to have achieved a kind of hegemony over the Conservative party, and to have elbowed the pure free-marketeers to one side. All that said, it is right to question how much it matters...A little conflict between getting the state out of the boardroom but back into the bedroom...
> Further, it is of course true...that in many ways a free market implies both the reassertion of the family (to provide previously public services in the home) and a state strong enough to impose its discipline on those unwilling to accept the brisk logic of unfettered capitalism (David Edgar, 1983, "Bitter Harvest" New Socialist September/October, p. 23)

This apparent contradiction between a political commitment to a "non-interventionist" role for the state in economic and social policy and an interventionist role in questions of family and sexual morality has been noted by Eisenstein in her review of the American New Right (op. cit., p. 577).

Ehrenreich has also seen the way that family matters have become a central plank of New Right thinking as fundamental. She claims that, for the US at least, it was the issue of family life and the relationship between the sexes that was crucial in the conversion of the Old Right into the New Right in the US. "What was more innovative was to present feminism as a threat to women" argues Ehrenreich (op. cit., p. 158). She goes on:

> "For the affluent male (and indirectly his wife) the right had always offered a program of economic self-interest: lower taxes, fewer regulatory obstacles to the predatory conduct of business, measures to restrict the tyranny of labor etc. The inspiration that helped to transform the "old right" as represented by the John Birch society, to the New Right as represented by Schlafly's STOP-ERA and a host of single-issue organisations with "pro-family" sympathies lay in the realization that it was possible to appeal directly to affluent, but dependent women." (Ehrenreich op. cit., p. 161)

Here she is of course talking not of the Reagan administration (which is more comparable with the Thatcher government) but New Right political pressure groups, and their political appeal. Indeed she adds:

> "For the affluent man, the right offered a way to hold on to his class privileges in the face of encroaching Communists, criminals, workers etc. For the affluent woman, the right offered a way to hold on to a man" (ibid.)

Political pressure groups of the ilk of the American fundamentalist Christian Moral Majority are certainly not as influential in the media in Britain as the USA. But there is even some question about the enduring political influence of the New Right pressure groups in the US. The synthesis of authoritarian populism with what is called neo-Conservatism in the US (what we in Britain would call neo-Liberalism) is not dissimilar, as regards the policies of the Reagan administration.

With more or less explicitness, both Thatcher and Reagan, and the pressure groups that successfully exert influence upon them, are keen to reinstate the 'ideal' family, or what Berger and Berger call "the bourgeois family" as a term of approval. (Peter Berger and Brigitte Berger, 1983, The War over the Family, Anchor Press, Doubleday, p. 96-7). For example, Ferdinand Mount who was chief policy advisor to Mrs. Thatcher when her secret policy group were considering family policy has written profusely about the family. In his book The Subversive Family he argues the importance and naturalness of marriage for creating "children and grandchildren, heirlooms of flesh and blood". George Gilder, probably Mount's counterpart in the US, has also argued for the centrality of marriage and women's economic dependence on men to maintain social and moral order. Eisenstein summarizes it:

> "Disruption of family life creates disruption in the economy because men need to direct their sexual energies toward the economy and they only do so when they are connected by family duty. Marriage creates the sense of responsibility men need: "A married man...is spurred by the claims of family to channel his otherwise disruptive male aggressions into his performance as a provider for wife and children." (Eisenstein op. cit., p. 576)

Gilder argues that it is the welfare state that has created the problems of female headed households, saying that "man has been cuckolded by the compassionate state". Irving Kristol has also indicted the state for creating the trends which result in "making the child fatherless; the mother husbandless; the husband useless" (cited by Nigel Ashford, 1981, in Government and Opposition, 16, 3, p. 357). These New Right thinkers therefore argue for a withdrawal of state intervention in the family and an increase in private family responsibility.

Weeks does not see New Right thinking in the US and Britain as similar. He argues that the New Right's commitment to family and "traditional morality" in the US is greater than in Britain. He claims

> "in Great Britain the rise of the New Right has depended much less on sexual conservatism and the moral authoritarianism of the Right has shared an uneasy bed with economic individualism. There has been no direct or concerted attack on the gains of the last 10 years while the modern Conservative party, defender of family and home, even tolerates a gay group within its ranks trading on its name. But there has been a closing of space" (Jeffrey Weeks, 1984, "Gay Switchboard - 10 Years On" Marxism Today, April, p. 38)

What are we to make of these differences in interpreting the influences of pressure groups and governments? It is probably true that Thatcherism is not very anti-gay, but then nor is Reaganism. The commitment to family morality in Britain, as a commitment to marriage, sexual fidelity and sexual morality, is no doubt as strong as in the US.

The chief attempt in the US to legislate family morality was the Family Protection Act which twice failed to win Congressional approval (1980-1982). It was described as a "tidy wish list for the New Right" by Congressional Quarterly staff writers (the official report of Congressional matters). It not only included attempts to proscribe the activities of gays but to restrict the teaching of women's studies, contemporary approaches to sex roles and to provide a bigger role for parents in guarding their children's sexual morals and education. It also tried to give religion a bigger place in the now conventional secular schools of the US as well as giving religious organisations a bigger voice. The only part of the Act subsequently to receive approval and federal funds in 1982 was the teenage chastity programme, which restricted the disbursement of federal monies to family planning organisations which developed "family-centred" preventative approaches. Such approaches would require parental consent for minors' use of birth control techniques and for minors' abortions. This restriction on the activities of family planning agencies is no mean measure since over a million teenage women get pregnant each year and about half of them seek abortions (Andrew Hacker, 1983, U/S, Penguin, p. 56-64). There have also been a series of sustained attempts to restrict the liberal grounds for abortion in the US, in particular individual states have sought to write in clauses requiring parental consent for minors. None of these has yet been successful.

In Britain, attempts to restrict the sexual activities of teenage girls have not been as comprehensive as these American moves appear to be. But there have been similar efforts to restrict the liberal approach to birth control techniques and abortions for girls under the age of 16. For example, Victoria Gillick an ardent Catholic and ex-Powellight has been trying, through the courts to get the government's DHSS to restrict the grounds on which girls under 16, without parental consent, get contraceptives. ("The racist past of a morality campaigner Searchlight February 1984, p.3) Her original court case was lost but her appeal is still pending and is scheduled for November 1984. She has not, however, successfully marshalled right-wing groups behind her and the opposition to her case is also very strong. The British Medical Association, for example, is strongly opposed on the grounds that such restrictions would infringe upon clinical freedom. ('Thatcher backs U-turn on under-16 pill', The Guardian, 17.2.84.) The agony aunts, that is writers of problem pages in women's journals and magazines, united in a visit to Mrs. Thatcher to oppose such restrictions and the argument that contracaptives increase promiscuity. But there are also strong supportive groups - the Salvation Army, the Roman Catholic Teachers' Federation and the Responsible

Society - which are building up a national petition campaign. ("PM urged to restore parents' rights" The Guardian, March 1984) Equally there have been attempts to restrict the grounds for obtaining abortions. For example, there was an attempt to prosecute a liberal gynaecologist, Peter Huntingford, for his explicit claim to perform abortions on underage girls without parental consent. The case, however, was quietly dropped.

These pressure group activities apart, what of the government's attempts to legislate about the family or otherwise curtail and circumscribe the activities of women within the family? Mrs. Thatcher has sought not to reduce the financial hardship and distress as a result of family changes but to stem their continuance through reductions in what she herself has called "the nanny State". She is deliberately trying to foster "Victorian values" of self-reliance and self-help, making the "private" family responsible for its own financial well-being, within a framework of particular moral values. Davidoff and Hall have illustrated how such Victorian values contain a vision of the Victorian family that is "constructed on a very specific type of family authority and sexual division of labour" (L. Davidoff and C. Hall, 1983, "Home Sweet Home" New Statesman vol. 105, no. 2723, 27 May, "Victorian Values: Special Supplement.) The ways in which the Thatcher government is trying to achieve this aim are complex. It is not just through specific policies aimed at the family, but through general economic and social policies, too. Indeed, the main restrictions on families have occurred through economic policies which are heralded as coping with economic crisis through reductions in public spending. Together these policies are aimed at "restructuring the welfare state" although many critics have argued that they will result in "dismantling the welfare state". These policies both reduce the discretion of government agencies, especially local government which is chief agency for social service spending, to spend money and also redirect spending on specific social services. Stewart for example shows that since 1979 there have been 5 separate bills in Parliament to change "the rules of the game...to achieve what the Government wants."

He adds:

> "To understand the philosophy of the present Conservative government it is important not to be misled by the rhetoric of rolling back the power of the State: it is a rolling back in certain sectors only. There is a further important element that emphasises the authority of central government. Any other source of political authority however limited and constrained is seen as a challenge to that authority. It is in this context that one must interpret the continual emphasis by the Government on the unitary state. (J. Stewart, 1984,"Storming the Town Halls: a Rate-Cap Revolution", Marxism Today, April, p. 8-9)

In general the process of cutting social spending has become known as "privitisation". This has usually been understood to mean shifting responsibility from the public sector to private enterprise, either by giving up local government control or by "contracting out" the provision of local services. The emphasis in the rhetoric is on giving more responsibility to private, commercial and profit-making enterprises although voluntary, charitable organisations have also been involved. In fact, the process has a direct and severe impact on private families, too, especially women's role within them.

Some examples will shed light on this. Local Education Authorities (LEAs) are the largest local spenders so cuts in public expenditure strike particularly hard at schools. Many LEAs have dealt with the situation by cutting budgets for particular aspects of the school curriculum or replacing them with charges. Aspects of the curriculum previously financially "free" are now seen as extra-curricular activities and provided at a direct cost to parents - music, swimming, dancing, etc. More important, however, is that there is a direct impact on school materials - textbooks, pencils and paper, the maintenance of school buildings and staffing levels. All have been adversely affected. Parents have been recruited in a variety of guises to make up the lack. In particular schools have had to rely on voluntary rather than paid labour to maintain a semblance of standards. On the one hand, PTAs have increasingly been called on to raise funds for the core curriculum to spend on extra textbooks, on paper and pencils and on maintaining the fabric of the schools.

More complicated however is the reliance on the daily labour of mothers in the actual teaching process. Increasingly at primary school level mothers are enticed into schools on the pretext of helping with child development. They become an unpaid teaching resource - teaching arithmetic, as listening mothers, laminating and selling books, cooking etc. The head of a local primary school boasts of "51 parental helpers" per week - all of them mothers. Is this amount of involvement really exploitation - of women cut off from the world of real employment through unemployment and job-segregation in the labour market? But do we, at the same time, whatever the cost, improve the daily lives of some of our children? Within schools mothers help may modify social inequalities, although it does pit "working mums" against "helping mums". It also means that in middle class areas where a lot of stay-at-home mothers are trained teachers or otherwise professionally qualified the schools is getting skilled unpaid helpers. In that area, where probably PTA funds go to buy extra textbooks and materials the cuts have less effect than in an inner city area where less maternal help is available and the mothers who help are less skilled. This goes against the whole idea of universal education.

So do other specific statutory changes, such as those in the 1980 and 1981 Education Acts. The "day-care" functions of schools through school meals have been reduced. School meals have been abandonned in some LEAs, in others "contracted out" to commercial firms and in yet others mothers asked to club together to provide the service cheaply. The results have been more unpaid work for mothers either providing packed lunches, having children home for lunch or now being used as cheap "dinner ladies". "Day-care" for preschool children has also been dramatically changed. On the one hand, many LEAs have modified the age of entry into compulsory schooling to 5 years old (Times Educational Supplement, June 7th 1984). Others have closed nursery schools. Both, together with cutbacks in public support for preschool provision, have forced a return to the private, maternal system of child-rearing before compulsory schooling. Day nurseries, provided through social services rather than education, have always been a stigmatised service reaching a tiny minority of young children have been cutback. Penn and Simpson document the political debate over the closure of a day nursery in Wakefield:

> "In an angry debate...the social services chair was challenged as to how she, as a mother, could countenance the closure of the council's only two day nurseries. She replied, according to her own letter to a local newspaper, "I looked after my own children"...the implication is clear..." (H. Penn and R. Simpson, 1984, New Society, 12 April, vol. 68, no. 1116, p.71)

Mothers are forced to look after their own, rely on their mothers, friends, neighbours and other private services. Where employers provide nurseries, the inland revenue now taxes the subsidized element viewing it as a "perk" rather than an expense.

There is far more support for non-employed mothers, but this relies on the voluntary unpaid labour of themselves and other mothers. The government's Under-Fives Initiative provides funds for voluntary organisations to subsidize schemes, especially for disadvantaged mothers. One "befriending" scheme such as Home-Plus advertises for middle class mothers of schoolage children to volunteer to befriend a young mother and help her to learn how to 'cope'. Only women are recruited and their own homes are inspected for neatness and tidiness before they are taken on. If the disadvantaged mothers fail to respond, the Pre-school Home Visitor has to report to the official social worker attached to the scheme.

Moves within social services are generally towards such family services. The government has also given support to the development of family centres either through voluntary organisations such as the Church of

England Children's Society or its own day nursery. They may be drop-in centres, therapeutic communities or may informally 'teach parent education'. For example, the job specification for a young nursery nurse in one local authority is to be able to teach parenting skills, to their clients, usually equally young teenage mothers often from ethnic minorities. The whole aim is to teach mothers to cope alone. Built in obsolescence is the ultimate aim.

This is also true of developments in education for parenthood provided at school to teenagers. In the new scheme - the technical and vocational education initiative (TVEI)

> "there are worries about how it is working. One of the most obvious is sex stereotyping which privately many admit is rampant. Schools have found girls opting for courses which lead to traditional women's jobs, home economics and looking after others and boys choosing the technical and heavy craft courses". (Lucy Hodges, 1984, The Times, April 2nd)

Parenthood is clearly being carefully and skillfully designed and made into an occupation for girls, although disapprobation is still heaped on girls who become mothers whilst still in school. Parenthood is, in any event, very important to the New Right. In their latest initiative they aim to give more influence to parents in the running of schools, through the transformation and increased powers of governing bodies. (Green Paper, Parental Influence at School, HMSO, 1984, cmnd 9242) Although it is important that parents have a strong voice in the running of schools since they act as proxies for their children this should not be to the detriment of the professionals and the community. The conservative moves are to increase consumerism in education. Another example is that members of the Independent Schools Information Service (ISIS) are now offered discounts at particpating stores (Times, 2-4-84). Mothers are encouraged to buy videotapes to help their children to learn to read. Toyshops are now renamed to fit the vogue: witness the Early Learning Centre. Hall expresses these developments:

> "The right have temporarily defined the terms and won the struggle because they were willing to engage. For a brief period in the 1960s and 1970s the involvement of parents with the school was the left's most democratic trump card. The dismantling of this into "parental choice" and its expropriation by the right is one of their most significant victories. They stole an idea designed to increase popular power in education and transformed it into an idea of an educational supermarket (S. Hall, 1983, "Education in Crisis" in A.M. Wolpe and J. Donald (eds.) Is there anyone here from Education? Pluto Press.

The developments are complex, they often build upon important initiatives and ideas provided by feminists and the left. But the central vision is of a new form of private parenthood, with mother as the chief orchestrator of children's needs. In this the New Right pinpoints the overriding dilemma of providing for intimate and personal relationships for women and children.

The focus must not just be of getting women into the public world of employment but of involving men in the private world of child care, of breaking down the false distinctions between public and private, between care and employment. Ann Phillips expresses it well for the question of employment:

> "We have to adapt work to fit in with the rest of life, and particularly adapt it to fit with children. For the present, the adaptation is done by women, the price of having children is paid by mothers. Why not a new approach? If the needs of children do not fit with the demands of full-time work, then the jobs must be changed." (Anne Phillips, 1983, Hidden Hands, Pluto Press, p.5)

Instead of mothers being forced to choose family responsibility and being "taught" how to mother properly informally, the task of rearing children should be made into a major public concern, with schools, care and work organised to fit with it. Fitting mothers for child care is not a fitting concern for socialists and feminists. The task of creating an adequate vision of parenthood and child care in late twentieth century Britain is urgent, given the current transformations into a fixed system of private family responsibility.

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE DISCOURSE OF CRISIS, POWER AND VISION

Henry Giroux

Neo-Conservative Discourse and the Crisis in Education

At a time when a different language of analysis is needed to understand the structure and meaning of schooling, American educational theory has retreated back into the seemingly apolitical discourse of management and administration. Put simply, amidst the growing failures and disruptions in both American society and in the public schools, a set of concerns and problems has emerged conjured up in discourses and practices that merge the ideological tenets of possessive individualism with the worst dimensions of managerial and technological logic. The stress is no longer on helping students to "read" the world critically; instead, it is on helping students to "master" the tools of reading. The question of how it might be possible to make schooling meaningful so as to make it critical and how we can make it critical in order to make it emancipatory has been subsumed under the imperative to master procedures and "facts".

It is instructive to note that the conservative discourse that currently dominates the debate on education in the United States has strengthened and sustained its position by linking the crises in everyday life with the failure of public schooling. By doing so, it has managed to shift public attention away from the more pressing structural and ideological problems that characterize the dominant society. Moreover, conservative coalitions have been able to intervene into popular concerns about schooling around a number of ideological issues in a way that has rendered the left almost invisible in the current debate. This points to the equally important issue regarding the failure of the American left to have any impact on this debate either in terms that highlight the real crisis in public education or in terms that expose the false premises that underlie the neo-conservative coalitions.

I want to argue in this essay that public education in the United States faces a dual crisis. On the one hand, there is a crisis grounded in the neo conservative threat to all public spheres, including schools, that contain the possibility for critical learning and dialogue. On the other hand, there is a crisis that centers around the failure of radical educational discourse either to illuminate adequately the nature of the existing failures of American education or to provide a theoretical discourse for educational reform. I will first examine the nature of the neo-conservative ideology and threat to public education in the United States.

There are hints of the magnitude of the current crisis in American education in the language of the recent reports on public education.[1] In the words of the Commission on Excellence, we are a "nation at risk" because of the poor quality of our educational system. Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation report argues that "the teaching profession is in crisis in this country," and, the National Task Force on Education for Economic Growth claims that "a real emergency is upon us." Needless to say, the nature and extent of the crisis in public education and its relationship to the wider society are the objects of national debate. This debate is important, not only because it focuses attention on the declining quality of our schools and economy, but also because it brings into view a "new" public philosophy,[2] one that, in my estimation, is as problematic as the crises that it attempts to define and resolve.[3]

Within this debate there are some underlying fundamental questions that need to be brought into the public arena. On the one hand, there is the question of whether the public philosophy that has defined the parameters of the existing crisis and the varied recommedations to resolve it has adequately named the mature of the crisis the United States currently faces. On the other hand, there is the issue of whether this neo-conservative public philosophy presently dominating the debate on education is as problematic as the issues it has criticized.

What is most striking in the current debate is the relationship that is being drawn between the state of the

American economy, with its lagging performance domestically and its shrinking preeminence in the international marketplace, and the failure of the schools to educate students to meet the economic needs of the dominant society. In some cases, it is argued that schools are in fact responsible for this crisis; in other instances, more restrained voices have claimed that while schools may not have caused the economic crisis, they can lesson it by promoting excellence and educational leadership. What these and other diverse voices share is a discourse that defines economic rationality as the model of public reason. This discourse is evident, for instance, in the Commission on Excellence report when it measures educational success against the need to maintain "the slim competitive edge we still retain in world markets;" this form of logic is also evident in the Economic Growth Task Force report's claim that public schools "are not doing an adequate job of education for today's requirements in the workplace, much less tomorrow's."

The important point here is that economic rationality in the current debate becomes both the referent and ideal for change. That is, within this rationality, business and educational leaders argue for specific forms of knowledge that are deemed important for our schools and the future of our society. For instance, high status knowledge is measured against the benefits it provides to national security and technological growth. Thus, science, math, and forms of knowledge associated with high technology occupy a high status position in this model. Furthermore, as an ideal, this model of economic rationality becomes the basis for new relationships between the schools and the economic sector.

Within this discourse, schools become important to the degree that they can provide the forms of knowledge, skills and social practices necessary to produce the labor force for an increasingly complex, technological economy. Morever, the solutions for school reform that have emerged from the current debate are strongly shaped by the technocratic and instrumental logic that inform this model of economic reason. In other words, the concerns that inform the existing debate are largely technical in nature and include such recommendations as extending the school day, raising teacher salaries, and enforcing school discipline. Even when there is an appeal to improving excellence, the latter often gets defined less in terms of a substantive call for developing higher order forms of critical reasoning and civic behavior than it does in terms of procedural demands for more stringent modes of competency testing and evaluation.

The neo-conservative philosophy that characterizes this debate fails not only in terms of its analysis of American schools and the nature of the existing crisis, it also fails to provide a vision that takes seriously the kind of thoughtful participation in socio-political life that is expected from citizens in a democratic society. Moreover, the undue emphasis this discourse places on specific cognitive and technical outcomes represents an ideology that undermines the importance of promoting the development of critical public spheres where the capacity for learning is not reduced to economic or technical considerations, that is, public spaces where people can learn and practice the skills of democratic participation in the wider political, social, and cultural processes that structure American society.[4] In this case, what is being stressed moves far beyond the traditionally conservative demand to teach students how to become functionally literate or how to master minimal competencies and basic skills. In actually, the logic underlying neo-conservative discourse centers around support for a marriage between public schools and the business community, on the one hand, and a dizzying celebration of testing, sorting procedures, and the mastery of technical and specialized skills on the other. Within the diverse intellectual strands that characterize this discourse is a theoretical indifference to providing students with the knowledge and skills necessary for a broad understanding of the socio-political processes at work in this country.

It is my belief that neo-conservative discourse abdicates the responsibility needed to insure that public schools can function to enable students "to experience a meaningful sense of personal and political liberty and to live a moral life, that is, a life lived in accord with moral rules and principles."[5] Moreover, this abdication reinforces the developing crisis in moral and civic courage that the United States currently faces. This issue points, in fact, to a very different crisis than that being emphasized in the existing debate, The crisis, I have in mind is one that centers around the failure of the United States not only to broaden its conception of the proper role of the citizen in a democratic society, but also its failure to promote an ethic of civic responsibility that holds in check those privatized and narrow interests that constantly threaten the public good. That is, United States society confronts a risk that, in part, centers around the failure to take seriously the need to develop an educational theory informed by the principles of critical literacy and civic courage, issues that should be at the core of any debate regarding educational policy at the various levels of government organization.[6] But before analyzing why I think the notions of critical literacy and civic courage should constitute the basis for a public philosophy out of which to establish a policy position and critical discourse regarding educational theory and practice, I want to address more specifically some of the general failures of the neo-conservative discourse I have just criticized.

Neo-conservative discourse, with its celebration of economic and technocratic reason, begins with the wrong problems;

furthermore, it misrepresents the problems it endorses, and, in doing so, advocates the wrong solutions. The current economic crisis facing the United States has not been caused by public education, though the economic crisis has had a significant effect on the problems schools are experiencing. High unemployment, declining productivity, inflation and the persistence of vast inequalities in wealth and power in this country have little to do with the absence of school related skills. In addition to poor planning and bad investment policies, the economy has undergone a major shift from its traditional agricultural and manufacturing base to high technology and service industries. As a result, the number of jobs requiring middle level skills have been gradually eroding. This has not only produced high unemployment levels, it also points to the growing polarization of future job opportunities.[7] The implications this has for schools are at odds with the urgent demands by educational and economic leaders that the country implement a massive educational program to train students for the high technology job revolution. The irony of this recommendaton becomes clear in the most recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates that the bulk of jobs that will be available in the next ten years will be in low level service industries that require very little skill, and that a relatively small proportion of jobs will be available in the high technology fields.[8] Educating a labor force with skills for which there will be few jobs available, while simultaneously ignoring the growth of a market that demands fewer and fewer intellectual skills, raises fundamental questions about the nature of the economy itself and the ideologies that legitimate it.

Needless to say, the quality of schooling has been deeply affected by the crisis in the economy and this is evident in the financial stress that plagues many school systems. In many major cities in the United States, inflation, plant closings, and unemployment have left communities with fewer economic resources to tax.[9] This shrinking tax base has contributed to massive teacher lay offs, the closing of schools, the growing shortage of curriculum materials, and the elimination of many school programs. If there is a crisis in the quality of education in the United States it has been intensified by these trends, trends for which public education is not responsible. But there are other problems that must be highlighted. Schools for many students, particularly those from the bottom of the socio-economic levels of society, offer few opportunities for self and social enpowerment. For these students, schooling is a place that disconfirms rather than confirms their histories, experiences and dreams. In part, this is indicated by the alienation expressed in the high rate of student absenteeism, school violence, and refusal of many students to take the academic demands and social practices of schools seriously. It is alarming to note, for instance, that it is estimated that on any one day in New York city 50% of the students are absent from school.[10]

As many educational critics have pointed out, these problems are primarily social and political in nature, and they cannot be understood solely within the framework proposed by neo-conservative spokespersons. These are problems that need explanations and solutions other than those that presently dominate the debate on education. But, it is one thing to argue that neo-conservatives have misrepresented the crisis in education and proposed inadequate solutions, it is another issue altogether to claim that they have actually contributed to it. It is to this issue that I will now turn.

Underlying the neo conservative commitment to reordering public education are a set of assumptions that are profoundly reactionary in nature and detrimental in purpose to viewing schools as institutions that provides a noble public service. Offering little or no critique of how existing social, political and economic institutions may contribute to the reproduction of deep inequalities in this society, neo-conservative discourse is generally silent about how schools might be influenced by such institutions in reproducing structural and ideological inequalities. In effect, what is missing here is any understanding of how power, ideology, and politics work on and in schools so as to undermine the basic values of community and democracy. For instance, there is no room in this discourse for understanding how the quest for excellence might be undermined by the realities of social class, privelege, and other powerful socio-economic forces that pull schools in the opposite direction; or for comprehending those school practices that systematically promote failure among certain segments our nation's youth, particuarly working class and minority youth; or, finally, for understanding that many of the problems schools face are, in part, political, cultural,and economic in nature and transcend the limited focus on individual achievement and success. Futhermore, within this model of rationality public education is defined primarily through a struggle for economic success and individual mobility. These are not entirely negative goals, but an undue emphasis on them suggests that economics is more important to our nation and schools than our commitment to democratic principles.[11] Such a view is not only wrong, it also provides the philosophical basis for launching an assault on the relevance of any public sphere dedicated to goals other than those which merely defend narrow models of technical reason and economic needs.

What is at issue is the importance of recognizing that neo-conservative discourse represents an ideology that does not contain an adequate rationale for defending schools, or any other public sphere committed to performing a democratic public service. That is, such a philosophy does not contain an adequate justification for linking schools to a philosophy that promotes a form of civic consciousness, one that encourages the development of an active citizenry and public participation on the basis of moral and ethical principles, as opposed to forms of participation tied merely to economic self sufficiency and self interest. Neo-conservative discourse is tied largely to assumptions that view schools as means to increasing individual achievement and promoting industrial needs. Such a view makes it difficult to defend public education in political and ethical terms. In fact, it lends support to programs aimed at defunding and dismantling public education. Put another way, its model of economic reason cannot generate a discourse that defends programs as a public service tied to improving democratic traditions.

Needless to say, a critique of the new-conservative position would have to gegin on very different terms and principles. It would have to defend schools as public spheres responsible for developing an indispensable public service to the nation. Such a view would point to the value of schools as institutions designed to awaken the moral, political, and civic responsibilities of its youth. This would demand an altogether different form of discourse, one which would point to very different problems in public education, advocate different solutions, and provide a different rationale for educational practice. The fundamental question, one that points to the second crisis under analysis, is one that has haunted many educational and political critics. In its many variations the question asks: "What principles should be used to reconstruct American schools on the basis of emancipatory and democratic values?"

Radical Theories of Schooling and the Crisis in Marxist Discourse

Within the last decade, radical theories of schooling have borrowed heavily from the traditions of Marxist theory in order to answer the above question and to simultaneously reveal the deep rooted class inequalities that characterize both the schools and the wider society.[12] Radical educators have made clear that schools share a particular relationship to the class structure and economic order of capitalist societies. The nature of this connection, for example, has been explored in great depth through the concept of the hidden curriculum with its emphasis on the political logic underlying classroom relations and the social relations of the workplace.[13] In addition, radical educators have focused on the ideological nature of classroom knowledge and school culture, and the role these play in legitimating the class specific nature of capitalist societies.[14] More recently, radical educators have focused on how class domination is formed within the processes of resistance and struggle, and how the school setting functions as a terrain for both promoting and containing such resistance in the interest of working class defeat and failure.[15] These various radical traditions have not only fundamentally challenged liberal and conservative views of schooling, they have made visible to educators a plethora of critical discourses that illuminate the various ways in which schools participate in the social, economic, and cultural reproduction of a class system.

The central argument I want to present briefly is that radical educational theories that have developed primarily within the contours of a largely classical Marxist framework, while having provided alternative theoretical educational perspectives have failed to provide the theoretical framework for either contesting neo-conservative discourse or for establishing the basis for a critical theory of schooling. Since the development of the diverse and various radical traditions that currently inform educational theory have been reviewed and criticized by a number of theorists recently, they need not be repeated here.[16] Instead I will illuminate those theoretical failures directly related to the overreliance by such theories on a Marxist discourse.

First, hegemony as used by radical educators is almost exclusively referred to as class domination. For instance, in more orthodox readings where schools are seen primarily as a reflex of the economic system, the nature and meaning of domination is explored through studies of the relationship between the workplace and the school. In some cases, classes represent not only the single referent for domination, they also become simple extensions of the relationships of production. Schools in turn seem to be driven by a logic that is simply an extention of the logic of capital accumulation.

While many radical educators have tended to shy away from a simple economic reductionism and class anaylsis of schooling, they still remain trapped within a paradigm that argues that education is organized along lines that correspond to the relations of the workplace, and that schools are primarily sites of class domination. This can be seen in the studies of Bowles and Gintis, and a number of others who work in the political economy tradition in the United States.[17] The restrictive nature of class analyses is also found in theorists who explore the role of schooling through areas other than the workplace and economic structure. That is, a number of Marxist theorists have used the categories of culture and ideology to explain how the internal workings of school contribute to the reproduction of capitalist societies. In this case, radical educators have used the notion of ideology to specify the way classroom knowledge and social practices function to legitimate capitalist rationality and values, but in most cases the rationality in question is reduced to the reproduction of class relations.[18]

That the conflict over schooling may be informed by other forms of struggle appears lost in this position. But such an ommission becomes even more glaring in those studies of schooling that attempt to interrogate the nature of school ideology and culture. For instance, the work of Bourdieu and

Passeron in France portrays school knowledge as the privileged cultural capital and experience of dominant classes. In this view, it is argued that schools prioritize the use of specific forms of knowledge, language, and skills that directly and indirectly legitimate and reproduce middle and upper class ideologies and cultural experiences.[19] Drawing from this position, Jean Anyon, Michael Apple, myself and others too often have viewed school knowledge as either a representation of specific class interests or as fulfilling the productive needs of the economic sector.[20] Moreover, the transition from radical critiques of schooling to the development of radical educational strategies has often been marred by a similar form of class reductionism. For example, the extremely important question of what constitutes 'really useful knowledge' in radical pedagogy for many on the left is often reduced to what is useful exclusively in terms of working class interests and culture. The notion that other social practices and forms of knowledge may prevail in constituting the lived experiences and cultural forms of both dominant and oppresed groups is often neglected in many radical accounts of schooling. This view of hegemony has resulted in some serious theoretical failings. First, it has resulted in the failure of many radical pedagogues to grasp how public and private representations are both produced and developed out of race, gender, and age-influenced cultural forms. Second, it has failed to promote radical educational inquiry into how these cultural forms work across a range of political and educational discourses and practices. Third, it has failed to promote the development of pedagogical strategies that can critically illuminate and offset the multifacited nature of domination while simultaneously illuminating the processes by which social groups engage in forms of emancipatory action that contain valuable pedagogical and political insights.[21]

A more radical notion of hegemony would be defined as more fundamental than class, and it would refer to any one of a number of social relations in which one group dominates another; this might include forms of domination steeped in the logic of patriarchal, racial, age, or class relations. Paralleling this notion is the insight that the economic realm and the activity of labor constitute only one site where domination is produced. For example, as the post-structuralist French philosophers have argued, the social field of domination is constituted, in part, by a grid of technologies, discourses and practices, based not on a model of labor, but on a monopolization of knowledge and information that supports the domination of one group over another. This leads to my next criticism.

Second, radical educators have often reduced the concept of ideology either to the logic of domination or to a method of inquiry designed to uncover how domination works in the interest of capitalist rationality. The notion of ideology as a positive moment in the formation of public and private representations, social movements, and as an expression of a group's struggle to constitute its social identity has been largely ignored within a Marxist paradigm on education.[22] While the notion of ideology as a form of domination is crucial to understanding how social and cultural reproduction work in and outside of schools, it must be extended to include analyses of how it functions to enpower specific groups to engage in social change.[23] Moreover, the complex and dialectical nature of ideology must be stressed in order to understand human agents as multilayered subjects; that is, as human beings who are more than merely class subjects, who exists as complex agents who live in different "nows," who embody a number of historically formed subjectivities, and who are both formed and act out of a variety of ideologies and cultural experience. In the most immediate sense this would necessitate developing a view of critical pedagogy around a notion of how lived experience is forged in a dialectical tension between elements of domination and reproduction, on the one hand, and elements of critical social formation and resistance on the other. If radical pedagogy has to become meaningful before it can become critical and emancipatory, the concept of what is meaningful to oppressed groups will have to be extended to include more than the notion of class experiences.

Third, radical educators have largely failed to develop an organic connection either to community people or to critical social movements. This is evident in both the theoretical work that characterizes educational theorizing as well as in the absence of major alliances between radical educators and other progressive social groups. Most theoretical work on schools focuses on either what goes on in schools or on ideologies about schools. For instance, there are theoretical critiques of the curriculum-in-use, the hidden curriculum, and the role of the state in schooling. But what is generally excluded from these perspectives is any acknowledgement of the historical and contemporary development of either oppositional public spheres and the organization of alternative forms of education within them, or any attempt to seriously understand and learn from popular experiences of schooling. Radical educators need to develop THEORIES OF PRACTICE, rather than THEORIES FOR PRACTICE. In this case, theory is not reduced to a technical instrument for change, an instant set of radical recipies for social action; instead, it begins with a dialectical reflection on the experiences and problems of excluded majorities. If this is kept in mind, theory becomes a guide for practice rather than a force that dominates it. Of course, I do not want to underestimate the material and ideological forces which isolate and threaten radical educators, forces that limit their political effectiveness or, even worse, incorporate them into the security of safe tenure systems and the rewards of academc promotion. I am simply suggesting that an overreliance on Marxist discourse, for instance, has often prevented such educators from taking the cultural capital and concrete struggles of various social groups seriously. Finally, Marxist discourse has failed to interrogate either the role that teachers play as organic intellectuals who come out of a specific set of class, gender, and racial experiences, or as part of a specific workforce that bears the historical logic andideological weight of the dominant societies of which they are a part. In the first instance, Marxist ideology has often presupposed that an allegiance to Marxist discourse exempts one from the societal contradictions that become an object of research and worl. The problem is always "out there." Thus, there is little understanding or research on how our own backgrounds either bear the weight of the existing society or contain emancipatory moments that speak to the new forms of socialrelations. Domination runs deeper than an alleged rationality and discourse. A critical view of depth psychology and an extended notion of Gramsci's view of the organic intellectual would be useful in moving beyond this impasse.[24] In the second instance, there is a need to view schools and the process of teaching as part of a set of economic, ideological, and cultural practices that both enable and restrain the development of collective identities among teachers and students. In both instances, the link between the individual and the wider society, on the one hand, and the individual and the dynamics of collective formation on the other become central concerns for understanding what is being produced in schools besides relations of production.

While the above criticisms of radical educational theory contain elements that can be incorporated into a new critical theory of education, I want to finish this essay by briefly analyzing some of the elements of critique and theoretical discourse that need to be considered for a more comprehensive theory of radical pedagogy.

Notes Toward a Radical Discourse of Schooling

If radical pedagogy is to become conscious of its own limitations and strengths within the existing society, it must be viewed as having an important but limited role in the struggle for creating a more just society. This suggests that radical teachers not only reevaluate the material and ideological conditions under which they work, but also raise new questions about the educative role they may undertake outside of schools. At stake here is the need to extend the possibilities for developing educational work by redefining the distinction between radical forms of schooling and radical forms of education. Moreover, at the present time there is an urgent need to create a new discourse regarding the debate over the nature of education and what it means as a process of self and social formation. Underlying the call for a new discourse about educational theory and practice is a dual concern. On the one hand, radical educators have to reconsider the content and purpose of school reform. On the other hand, they have to construct organic links with community people around the injustices that work in and through the schools; furthermore, radical educators have to actively involve themselves with social movements and groups involved in developing oppositional public spheres outside of schools around broader educational issues.

The dual role for radical pedagogues implicit in this analysis can be clarified by providing a distinction between schooling and education. Schooling as I use the term takes place within institutions that are directly or indirectly linked to the state through public funding or state certification requirements. Institutions that operate within the sphere of schooling often embody the legitimating ideologies of the dominant society; such institutions generally define their relationship to the dominant society in functional and instrumental terms, though, of course, room is also provided for forms of critical pedagogy [But it is important to remember that while such room is often provided within varied and changing circumstances, it is nonetheless provided generally within constraining ideological and material conditions]. Education is much more broadly defined, and as it is used in this context takes place primarily, but not exclusively, outside of established institutions and spheres. In the most radical sense, education represents a collectively produced set of experiences organized around issues and concerns that allow for a critical understanding of everyday oppression as well as the dynamics involved in constructing alternative political cultures. As the embodiment of an ideal, it refers to forms of learning and action based on a commitment to the elimination of class, racial and gender oppression. As a mode of intellectual development and growth, its focus is political in the broadest sense in that it functions to create organic intellectuals, and to develop a notion of active citizenry based on the self dedication of a group to forms of education that promote models of learning and social interaction that have a fundamental connection to the idea of human emancipation.

For radical teachers, it is imperative that strategies be developed that take as their starting point an understanding of how knowledge and patterns of social relations steeped in domination come into being in schools, how they are maintained, how students, teachers, and others relate to them, and how they can be exposed, modified, and overcome, if possible. I suggest that such a strategy can be organized around a pedagogy that argues for a notion of critical literacy and cultural power, while simultaneously presenting a strong defense for schooling as a public service. In the first instance, critical literacy would make clear the connection between knowledge and power. It would present knowledge as a social construction linked to norms and values, and it would demonstrate modes of critique that illuminate how, in some cases, knowledge serves very specific economic, political and social interests. Moreover, critical literacy would function as a theoretical tool to help students and others develop a critical relationship to their own knowledge. In this case, it would function to help students and others understand what this society has made of them [in a dialectical sense] and what it is they no longer want to be as well as what it is they need to appropriate critically in order to become knowledgeable about the world in which they live. Thus, critical literacy is linked to notions of self and social empowerment as well as to the processes of democraticization; in the most general sense, critical literacy means helping students, teachers, and others learn how to read the world and their lives critically and relatedly; it means developing a deeper understanding of how knowledge gets produced, sustained, and legitimated; and most importantly, it points to forms of social action and collective struggle.

As a form of critique, critical literacy would raise questions about modes of discourse and organization in schools that reduce learning and social practices to their technical dimensions. In other words, it would make problematic the instrumentalization and technicization of American education. Such a critique would analyze the technocratic ideology that dominates teacher education, the empiricist and technical thinking that governs state certification policies, and the 'methodological madness' that generally characterizes curriculum theorizing, classroom social relations, and technicist modes of evaluation and selection.[25] Of course, the reduction of thought to its strictly technical dimensions is only one aspect of how schools promote forms of political and conceptual illiteracy. At another level, schools disempower students, parents, and community people by disconfirming their histories, experiences, and, in effect, their role as historical agents. The point here is that the concept of critical literacy moves beyond the call for oppositional knowledge and social relations by acknowledging the need for educators to incorporate in their pedagogies the experiences and social practices that give a collective voice to specific individuals and groups, whether they be racial minorities, women, working class people, or alienated members of the dominant classes. Put another way, critical literacy interrogates the cultural capital of the oppressed in order to learn from it; it functions to confirm rather than disconfirm the presence and voices of the oppressed in institutions that are generally alienating and hostile to them. But the call to take the cultural capital of oppressed and oppositional groups seriously should not be mistaken for the traditional liberal argument for educational relevance. The latter makes an appeal to a pedagogy responsive to the individual interests of the student in order to motivate him or her. Critical literacy responds to the cultural capital of a specific group or class and looks at the way in which in can be confirmed, and also at the way the dominant society disconfirms students by either ignoring or denigrating the knowledge and experiences that characterize their everyday lives. The unit of analysis here is social, and the key concern is not with individual interests but with individual and collective enpowerment.

It must be remembered that many students grow up within the boundaries of a class culture, popular culture, and a school culture. It is on the terrains of class and popular culture that students develop an active voice. On the other hand, for many students school culture has little to do with either their histories or their interests; instead it becomes the culture of dead time, something to be endured and from which to escape. Of course, school culture is really a battle ground around which meanings are defined, knowledge is legitimated, and futures are sometimes created and destroyed. It is a place of ideological and cultural struggle favored primarily to benefit the wealthy, males, and whites. But it is precisely because there is room for struggle and contestation in schools around cultural and ideological issues that pedagogies can be devloped in the interest of critical thinking and civic courage.

Struggles within the schools have to be understood and linked to alliances and social formations which can effect policy decisions over the control and content of schooling. In effect, this means that radical teachers will have to establish organic connections with those parents and progressive groups who inhabit the neighborhoods, towns, and cities in which schools are located. Such an alliance points to the need for radical teachers to join with feminists, ecology groups, neighborhood organizations, and parents in order to question and strongly influence school policy. Critical literacy in this case points to forms of knowledge and social practice that take seriously the notion of school democracy. Moreover, it points to the need to develop a real defense of schools as institutions which perform a public service, a service defined by the imperative to create a literate, democratic and active citizenry. In this case, citizens who would be self-governing and actively involved in the shaping of public welfare.

Such a defense takes as its starting point, not the particularities of individual interests or forms of achievement as stressed by neo-conservatives, but the relationship of school to the demands of active forms of community life. An alternative radical discourse would begin by recognizing the relationship between the public sphere and the state, on the one hand, and the notion of learning and citizenship on the other. The public sphere, in my view, refers to those arenas of social life such as church associations, trade unions, social movements and voluntaary associations where dialogue and critique provide for the cultivation of democratic sentiments and habits. It is in this sphere that people not only create the conditions where they can explore and talk about their needs, but also where democratic traditions function so as to mediate the role of government action. That is, it is within the public sphere that forms of civic courage get nourished and displayed, and the state becomes not an object of veneration but an object of critical inquiry. Within this framework, civic courage represents a form of political and ethical scrutiny that defines citizenship not as a function of the state but as a quality tha permeates all of social life, a quality that speaks to forms of critical literacy and social enpowerment aimed at developing democratic and just communities. The principles that inform the role of the state and policy decisions within this context are organized around a political philosophy dedicated to the creation of an educated citizenry capable of exercising political and ethical leadership in the public sphere. This leads e directly to the notion of radical education.

For radical educators, this means working with community groups to develop pockets of cultural resistance based on new forms of social relations and practices; it also means working with adults around those issues directly related to their lives, and acting as educative citizens struggling to establish a social and economic democracy.[26] Radical educators can help to destroy the myth that education and schooling are the same thing, they can debunk the idea that expertise and academic credentials are the distinguishing marks of the intellectual; and, equally important, such educational work would also promote critical analyses of schooling itself and its relations to other institutions included in the state public sphere.

One of the most important purposes for creating alternative public spheres is to provide the conditions for the development of what Gramsci has called organic intellectuals. That is, intellectuals who are part of a specific class and/or movement and who serve to "give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields".[27] Gramci's notion of organic intellectual is important for radical educators because it broadens our understanding of the role of intellectuals by highlighting their social function as mediators between the state and everyday life. In this definition, the concept of intellectual is politicized. It rejects the current meaning of the term which restricts it to scholars, writers, etc. Morever, it suggests that oppositional groups have to form their own leadership, a leadership rooted in and committed to the history, experience, and set of goals they share with the people such intellectuals represent. This concept is important because it lays the theoretical ground for radical educators to examine their own organic connections to specific groups; at the same time, it points to establishing social relations with social groups in concrete institutional contexts such as neighborhoods, trade unions, etc. Furthermore, its logic argues for democratic organizations in which intellectuals and the masses coalesce around building their ascendency as groups fighting the material and ideological forces of domination, while simultaneously and self-consciously educating every member of the community to develop the general skills, knowledge, and capacities to govern.

Of course, at the present time only shadows of a left public sphere exist in the United States. These are organized mainly around journals, magazines, and academic publications. Some counterinstitutions also exist in the form of alternative schools, but generally the left has given little political attention to creating cultural sites where people who share a common language, set of problems, and cultural experience can come to argue, learn, and act collectively to transform their lives. The obstacles against the development of alternative public spheres are enormous. The media, the power of the corporations, the culture industry, and the state all function to keep oppositional groups on the defensive. Under these circumstances, it becomes difficult but absolutely essential to establish new agendas that can examine the preconditions for establishing a left public sphere, one that provides organc links to the popular masses.

In conclusion, it seems imperative that radical educators recognize the limits of neo-conservative and Marxian discourses. This is not a call to abandon Marxist discourse as much as it is a call to critically appropriate what is relevant to the present historical and contemporary juncture and to develop it as part of a new radical social theory which points to existing possibilities and more expanded opportunites for radical educational work. Of course, what I have provided is a broad theoretical sweep. The point has been to make a small contribution to rethinking those ideologies and practices that currently inform educational theory and practice in the United States and to provide some theoretical contributions for creating the basis for a new and more viable radical educational discourse.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See, for instance: The National Commission on Excellence in Education, United States Department of Education, chaired by David P.Gardner, "A Nation at Risk;" Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, chaired by James B. Hunt, Jr., "Action for Excellence;" The College Entrance Examination Board, Educational Equality Project, George H. Hanford, chair, "Academic Preparation for College;" Twentieth Century Fund, Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, Robert Wood, chair, Making the Grade; The Carnegie Corporation of New York, James B. Hunt, Jr. and David Hamburg, chairs, "Education and Economic Progress: Toward a National Education Policy."

[2] The notion of "new" public philosophy as it is being used in this essay comes from the work of Sheldon S. Wolin. See Sheldon S. Wolin, "The New Public Philosophy," _Democracy_ 1 (October 1981), pp. 23-36. Another excellent source can be found in James M. Giarelli, "Education and Democratic Citizenship: Toward a New Public Philosophy," an unpublished paper presented at the National Council for Social Studies Annual Meeting, Boston, MA., November 24, 1982, 19 pp.

[3] Representative examples of the "new" public philosophy can be found throughout the October 1983 issue of *Educational Leadership* and in the September 1983 issue of *Phil Delta Kappan.* Chester Finn, Jr. seems to epitomize the self serving anti-intellectualism that often characterizes this position. He writes: "I am hard-pressed to imagine how anyone could DISAGREE [his italics] with the Excellence Commission's curriculum recommendations-or, for that matter, with the Commission's other diagnoses, proposals, and suggestions." Chester E. Finn, Jr., "How Could Anyone Disagree?" *Educational Leadership.* 41 (October 1983), p.28. One of the most cogent disagreements with the National Commission on Excellence Report can be found in "Our Children at Risk: An Inquiry Into the Current Reality of American Public Education," a report published by The National Coalition of Advocates for Students (New York, 1983), 42 pp.

[4] I discuss the ideology of technocratic rationality and the importance of oppositional public spheres at great length in Henry A. Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition.* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1983).

[5] Michael Katz, "Critical Literacy: A Conception of Education as a Moral Right and Social Ideal," in *The Public School Monopoly.* ed. Robert Everhart (Cambridge, Mass.: Balllinger Press, 1982), p. 209.

[6] Some recent eloquent expressions of this position can be found in: Katz, ibid. James M. Giarelli, "The Public, the State, and the Civic Education of Teachers," in Civic Learning in Teacher Education. Society of Professors of Education Monograph Series, 1983; Michael W. Apple, "Politicizing 'Civic Values' in Education," in Civic Learning in Teacher Education. Society of Professors of Education Monograph Series, 1983; Jonathan Kozol. Prisoners of Silence: Breaking the Bonds of Adult Illiteracy in the United States. (New York: Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1980).

[7] Some important analyses of this issue can be found in: Stanley Aronowitz, Working Class Hero: A New Strategy for Labor. (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1983); Manuel Castells, The Economic Crisis and American Society. (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1980); Paul Weckstein, "Democratic Economic Development is the Key to Future Quality Education," Phi Delta Kappan. (February 1983), pp. 420-423.

[8] Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on occupations producing the most new jobs appeared in the New York Times (September 18, 1983).

[9] Weckstein, op. cit., p. 420.

[10] Robert B. Everhart, "Introduction," in The Public School Monopoly, op. cit., p. 3. For an excellent extended analysis of this issue see W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children, (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

[11] A glaring example of this can be found in Harold L. Hodgkinson's argument that the higher education community needs to take seriously the possibilities for minority youth to go on to some form of higher education. The ratiionale for such a concern is based on what he calls sheer middle class self-interest and writes that: "The dependency of middle-class white Americans on the success of minorities in school and at work is just beginning. Ninety percent of the work force in 1990 is already at work today, and close to half of the remainder will be minorities. Retiring white workers will find themselves increasingly dependent on a work force heavily composed of minorities to pay their Social Security trust funds." Harold L. Hodgkinson, "College Students in the 1990s: A Demographic Portrait," Educational Digest, (November 1983), p. 29.

[12] Some representative examples include: Michael Apple, Ideology and Curriculum (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); Samual Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America (New York: Basic Books, 1976); Martin Carnoy, ed. Schooling in a Corporate Society (New York: David McKay Inc., 1975); Madan Sarup, Marxism and Education

(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978); Paul Willis, *Learning to Labour* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1977); Michael Young and Geoff Whitty, eds. *Society, State, and Schooling.* (Lewes,Engand: Falmer Press, 1977); Theodor Mills and Bertell Ollman, eds. *Studies in Socialist Pedagogy* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978); Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977); Stephen Castles and Wiebke Wiestenberg, *The Education of the Future* (London: Pluto Press, 1979); Rachel Sharp, *Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling: Towards a Marxist Analysis of Education* (London: Routlede and Kegan Paul, 1980); Henry A. Giroux, *Ideology, Culture and the Politics of Schooling.* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981); Michael Apple, *Education and Power* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[13] Bowles and Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America;* Henry Giroux and Anthony Penna,"Social Education in the Classroom: the Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 7,1 (1979), pp. 21-42.

[14] Jean Anyon,"Social Class and School Knowledge," *Curriculum Inquiry* 11,1 (1981), pp. 3-41; Bourdieu and Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture.*

[15] The most celebrated example is Willis, *Learning to Labor;* See also Henry A. Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in*

Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1983).

[16] See the various articles in "Rethinking Social Reproduction," edited by Paul Olson, *Interchange* 12 2/3 (1981); see also George wood, "Beyond Radical Cynicism," *Educational Theory* 32, 2 (1982), pp. 55-71; Henry A. Giroux, "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis," *Harvard Educational Review* 63, 3 (1983), pp. 257-293.

[17] Bowles and Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist Society;* Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, "The Secondary School's Role in Social Stratification: A Comparison of Berverly Hills High School and Morningside High School," *Journal of Education* 162, 4 (1980), 83-112.

[18] Louis Althusser, "Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatuses," in *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays,* trans. Ben Brewster (New York: Monthly Review press, 1977), pp. 127-186.

[19] Bourdieu and Passeron, op. cit.

[20] Jean Anyon, "Ideology and U.S. History Textbooks," *Harvard Educational Review* 49, 3 (1979) pp. 361-386; Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum,* 1979; Giroux, *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling,* 1981. It must be

stressed here that the school and classroon have and are being viewed within this perspective as a locus of knowledge production and transmission. Up to the present time, the emphasis in this work has been focused too narrowly on forms of knowledge related primarily to class domination. For an extensive discussion of hegemony and schooling, see Giroux, Theory and Resistance in Education.

[21] Philip Wexler, "Movement, Class, and Education," in Len Barton and Stephen Walker, eds., Race, Class, and Education (London: Croom-Helm, 1983), pp. 17-39. This is an important essay because of its focus on the relationship between education and social movements.

[22] Giroux, Theory and Resistance in Education.

[23] Two excellent examples include: George Rude, Ideology and Popular Protest (New York: Pantheon, 1980); Alain Touraine, The Voice and the Eye: Analyses of Social Movements (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981); David W. Livingstone, Class Ideologies & Educational Futures, (London: Falmer Press, 1983). See also the special issue on social movemets in Telos 52 (Summer, 1982).

[24] Two useful recent examples are: Richard Lichtman, The Production of Desire, (New York: The Free Press, 1982); Philip Wexler, Critical Social Psychology, (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983).

[25] Michael Katz sheds some light on this issue in his analysis of how the notion of critical literacy as a pedagogical tool can be used to shape school policy and to develop an educated citizenry. He is worth quoting at length on this issue: "First, it[critical literacy] would provide a general basis for determining whether schooling policy and practice is seriously taking account of the value of critical thinking. The environments of schools characterized by a commitment to this value would be alive with the spirit of critical dialogue between teachers and students and among the students themselves. Various diverse forms of intellectual inquiry, moreover, would be evident. Students in this environment would expect to receive seriuos and constructive intellectual criticism on their work so that they would be able to internalize the standards for making reasoned intellectual appraisals of their own thinking and that of other people. On the other hand, schools that clearly did not take te value of critical thinking seriously might be ones that were dominated by rote memorization, routine drill, and passive, unquestioning acceptance of everything said by the teacher or written in textbooks. Such schools would discourage students from questioning their teachers and expressing divergent views." See Michael Katz, "Critical Literacy: A Conception of Education as Moral Right and Social Ideal," in *The Public School Monopoly*, ed. Robert Everhart (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballilnger Press, 1982), p. 209.

[26] The most important work to date that illustrates this position and type of educational work is that of Paulo Freire. See especially, Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed. (New York: Seabury Press, 1970); Paulo Freire, Education for Critical Consciousness. (New York: Seabury Press, 1973);
Paulo Freire, The Politics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation. (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, forthcoming). See Also: D. Dolci, A New World in the Making. (Westport, Greenwood Press, 1976).

[27] Antonio Gramsci, Prison Notebooks. trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

About the Contributors

MICHAEL W. APPLE is Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

PHILIP CORRIGAN is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology of Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto.

MIRIAM E. DAVID is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Social Administration, University of Bristol, England.

ROSEMARY DEEM is a Lecturer in the School of Education, The Open University, Milton Keynes, England.

HENRY GIROUX is Professor of education at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

GAIL P. KELLY is Professor in the Department of Educational Organization, Administration and Policy, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Occasional Papers published by the Comparative Education Center

State University of New York at Buffalo

1. Philip G. Altbach and Gail P. Kelly, Comparative Education: A Preliminary Bibliography (April, 1981), OUT OF PRINT (A revised and expanded version of this paper has been published by Praeger Publishers under the title of International Bibliography of Comparative Education). This volume is available directly from the publisher, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, 10017.

2. Chuka Okonkwo, Language in African Education: A Comparative Analysis of the Curricular Elements of School Texts (May, 1978).

3. Lois Weis, Schooling, Attitudes and Modernization: The Case of Ghana (Spring, 1979).

4. Burton Clark, Internationalizing Higher Education: Report of Conference (April, 1979) OUT OF PRINT

5. Philip G. Altbach, The Academic Profession: Perspectives on an International Crisis (With Bibliography), (November, 1979).

6. Gail P. Kelly, The Professionalization of Teachers and the Distribution of Classroom Knowledge: Perspectives from Colonial Vietnam (September, 1980).

7. John Bodnar, Vandra Masemann, Ray C. Rist, Multicultural Education: Perspectives for the 1980s (November, 1980).

8. Michael W. Apple and Philip Wexler, New Directions in Education: Critical Perspectives (1981).

9. Karen Biraimah, Unequal Knowledge Distribution: The Schooling Experience in a Togolese Secondary School (1981).

10. Lois Weis, ed., Issues in Education: Schooling and the Reproduction of Class and Gender Inequalities (1982).

11. Gail P. Kelly, "When I Become a Fonctionnaire": School Knowledge in French Colonial Africa. (1984)

12. Kowsar P. Chowdhury, Efforts in Universalization of Primary Education: The Case of Bangladesh (1984)

13. Excellence, Reform and Equity in Education: An International Perspective (Essays by Rosemary Deem, Michael W. Apple, Miriam E. David, and Henry Giroux)

PAPERS ARE AVAILABLE FOR $5 EACH, POSTPAID. PLEASE SEND A CHECK MADE OUT TO COMPARATIVE EDUCATION CENTER AND SEND TO THE CENTER, 428 BALDY HALL, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260 U.S.A.